





With the Author's Compliments

1

10

GREEKS & BULGARIANS

IN THE NINETEENTH AND
TWENTIETH CENTURIES

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE RIGHT HON.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE

BY

NEOCLES KASASIS

PROFESSOR OF ATHENS UNIVERSITY

PRESIDENT OF THE "HELLENISMOS SOCIETY"

LONDON

PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE & CO. LIMITED

TAVISTOCK STREET, COVENT GARDEN

1907

PREFACE

THIS book was written many months ago, soon after the tragic catastrophes which took place last year with unheard-of barbarity in some towns of the Bulgarian Principality and Eastern Rumelia. I now give it publicity on the anniversary of these occurrences; perhaps rather late, but in time, I hope, to enlighten public opinion in England, which, although it ought not to be, is in ignorance of what is going on in the Near East, and is misled by inaccurate publications. Perhaps there is still time for a friend of truth to go to the spot, investigate matters, and report publicly the results of his investigations in order thoroughly to enlighten the British public.

Similar things happened about thirty years ago, when public opinion in England was startled by the Bulgarian atrocities. Unhappily, the contemporary Bulgarian atrocities have been more awful. As the reader will see, the leader of them was the Bulgarian Government itself.

May I hope that as a result of this publication a Commission for the investigation of Macedonian matters will be appointed? I hardly dare to entertain such hope.

But History is written both for contemporaries and descendants, for enlightening, for teaching, not for amusement.

With this object, although I am a contemporary, I have roughly drawn this historical picture, which I offer to the English public. No doubt Britishers will understand how many and what criminal phenomena are covered by the political artifice of the Treaty of Berlin, which was drawn up in good faith on the part of the authors, but which of late has become a total denial of all the moral and political rules which govern the life of mankind.

I await the impartial judgment and verdict of the British public.

NEOCLES KASASIS

LONDON, *August* 1907

TO THE RIGHT HON.

SIR CHARLES DILKE, BART.

SIR,—It was during my absence from Athens that, with the connivance of the Bulgarian authorities, the mob in certain districts of Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia, and especially at Varna, Philippopolis, and Anchialos, perpetrated the most terrible outrages on the Greek population of these towns, who were forced to abandon their ruined homes and seek an asylum elsewhere, the majority taking refuge at Athens.

These unprovoked crimes filled with horror and indignation a great portion of the civilised world.

But, on the other hand, both in Europe and America, amongst those who were either ignorant of the true facts of the case, or were influenced by Bulgarian propaganda, these same outrages were either defended by some who justified them on the ground that the activity of Greek bands in Macedonia demanded some kind of retaliation, or made light of by others who declared that they were purely imaginary and had never taken place at all; while in England especially public opinion, misled by the information of Bulgarian agents, sympathised rather with the perpetrators of these outrages than with their unfortunate victims.

Practically the whole of the English Press, with *The Times* at its head, published articles attributing to the Greeks themselves the responsibility for the outrages committed. Other organs of public opinion, both in England and on the Continent, were silent.

Has the standard of public morality indeed fallen so low? It is not for me to say, but rather simply to state the facts, and describe a condition of affairs which

can but bring pain to every friend of civilisation and humanity.

The Society over which I have the honour to preside considered it a duty, at this latest outbreak of Bulgarian violence, to appeal to the friends of the Greek nation in England, France, and Italy, with whom during the last period of national activity it had had such pleasant relations. Among the first, it appealed to you, for many years an eminent and proved friend of our nation—to you, Sir, who have so often expressed your affection and solicitude for Hellenism. Our Society could by no means ignore the kindness which you have shown towards the writer during his visit to London, and your intense interest in the cause which he has so much at heart. In you our Society justly recognised the most illustrious of all the English Philhellenes and one of the ablest and most cultured minds of the Anglo-Saxon race.

On my return to Athens, a few days after these lamentable events, I found your reply to our appeal, which I now have the honour to reproduce :

“DOCKETT EDDY, SHEPPERTON, MIDDLESEX,
“August 19, 1906.

“DEAR SIR,—I have your telegram. I had of course already seen with horror the telegrams relating the dreadful deeds you name. I shall at all times associate myself with those of every country who may join in the expression of the wish for the success of Greece and the extension of Hellenic civilisation. It would, I fear, be difficult to induce them to deal in detail with the various outrages which mark the struggle between the races and the Churches who are thrown together in South-East Europe.

“Sincerely,
“(Signed) CHARLES W. DILKE.”

At the same time as our Society appealed to you, the Metropolitan of Athens, who is also president of the committee for the aid of the refugees, wrote in the

following moving terms to the Archbishop of Canterbury :

“ *To HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.*

“The Church of Greece entreats your Grace’s sympathetic aid with regard to the unparalleled and entirely unprovoked outrages committed against the law-abiding Greeks of Bulgaria, and against the churches, monasteries, and church dignitaries, notwithstanding the protection to which all are entitled from the Great Powers, in virtue of the Berlin Treaty.

“The Church of Greece entreats, through your Grace, the fraternal intervention of the English Church with the British Government, so that an end may be put to further murders and rapine, which leave a stain on the age in which we live.

“(Signed) The Metropolitan of Athens,
“THEOCLITUS.”

To this entreaty the Archbishop of Canterbury replied as follows through the medium of the Bishop of Gibraltar :

“You are requested to inform the Metropolitan of Athens that the Archbishop of Canterbury has instructed me to make the following communication :

“That the telegram of his Holiness the Metropolitan of Athens arrived in England during his absence on the Continent, and was handed to him a few days ago, on his return.

“That the Archbishop, as well as the English Church in general, never interferes in questions of a political nature, and that it is impossible for the Archbishop to take any action which might be interpreted as a justification of the entry of bands from Greece into Turkish territory.

“The Archbishop therefore considered that it was not possible for him to send a telegraphic or an official reply, but he instructs me to assure his Holiness that the English Church learns with great sorrow of the

strife between the Christians of the East ; and he sends his brotherly greetings to his Holiness.

“The Bishop of Gibraltar also desires to offer his brotherly greetings and respect to the Head of the Greek Church.”

I do not desire, Sir, to express my own opinion of these two letters ; let the reader judge. I will only comment briefly on that part of the letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury in which he says that “the English Church learns with great sorrow of the strife between the Christians of the East,” and that “it is impossible for the Archbishop to take any action which might be interpreted as a justification of the entry of bands from Greece into Turkish territory.”

You, Sir, also, taking into consideration the erroneous opinion obtaining in England as to the character and motives of the conflicts between the different races in Macedonia, confessed with regret, in the letter which you addressed to the Board of our Society, that “It would be difficult to induce them to deal in detail with the various outrages which mark the struggle between the races and the Churches who are thrown together in South-East Europe.”

You will allow me, Sir, to differ from you, as well as from his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury and from all those who hold such ideas as to the activity in Macedonia and the conflicts between the different peoples inhabiting that country. I assert that these conflicts are not in the least due to religious or sectarian influences. The reasons for the anarchy which has become a scourge to that country must be sought elsewhere.

Those who have thoroughly investigated the Macedonian question, and have based their study on mere facts ; those who have visited this part of the Balkan Peninsula, and have examined the conditions without any racial, political, or sectarian prejudice, must confess that the present conflict in Macedonia is not due to religious antipathy or to differences of dogma ; nor is it a struggle of races—of Greeks and Bulgarians, or even of Slavs and

Greeks. The Greeks, it is true, are fighting in self-defence in one place against Bulgarians, in another against Turks; but in other parts Servians are opposing Bulgarians, and Rumanophiles contend against Greeks—indeed, the condition of Macedonia may be truly defined as *Bellum omnium contra omnes*.

What, then, are the real causes of these bloody conflicts carried on in full view of the nations of Europe, whose Governments have even on occasion fomented the quarrel for their own ends?

The phenomenon calls for an historical explanation.

I must first repeat that the present conflict in Macedonia, as in other parts of the Balkan Peninsula, is not one between Patriarchists and Exarchists, as Mr. Balfour implied in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury four years ago, in the words, "The Exarchist populations (the Bulgarians) persecute the Patriarchists (the Greeks) with yet more cruelty."

The Servians owe no allegiance to the Œcumenical Patriarch; they have their own independent Church, and have also reasons for not being on good terms with the Greek Church of Constantinople. Nevertheless, in the vilayet of Uskub, which is called by the Servians "Old Servia," the struggle between Servians and Bulgarians is as sanguinary as that between Bulgarians and Greeks in the vilayets of Monastir and Salonica.

It is doubtless true that both the Patriarchist and Exarchist clergy are taking part in the events occurring day by day in Macedonia. But it can hardly be otherwise, for, as you are no doubt aware, in the Turkish Empire, as in many European States, the clergy are by no means indifferent to any political or national movement among the people, nor do they regard with apathy their interests and ideals.

In France, in Italy and Spain, in Germany, and even in England, the clergy do not hold aloof from national questions, but, on the contrary, they are growing more enthusiastic in that respect than the people themselves.

In the Turkish Empire the same holds good. On the

day following the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks, the Patriarch of that city was not only recognised as the spiritual leader of all Orthodox Christians, but was also granted certain privileges in connection with national affairs by means of "Berats." And that these privileges were employed by the Patriarch as a means of ameliorating the condition of the Christian population, in spite of the difficult position of the clergy during the oppressive rule of the Turks, is a matter of history. In fact, I make bold to assert that, if the whole of Christian Eastern Europe escaped conversion to Islamism, this was not due to the Christian West, which remained absolutely indifferent to the fate of the Christian population of the provinces conquered by the Turks, except in so far as the sufferings of the "Orthodox" actually gratified the Western spirit of religious intolerance. With good reason, therefore, did the Patriarch of Constantinople bear the title of "Rum-Milet-Bashi," or Head of the Greek Nation.

During the latter part of the last century, when, owing to intrigues proceeding from certain well-known quarters, the Bulgarian Question was first mooted, and the rising of the Bulgarian race against the Turk was organised, that portion of the Bulgarian people inhabiting the district near the Balkans and the Danube was incited to rise against the Œcumenical Patriarch, and to demand, contrary to the regulations of the Church, ecclesiastical emancipation—in other words, independence of the Patriarchate. But the real object of this revolt was that ecclesiastical should be followed by political independence.

So far as regards the latter—*i.e.*, national and political independence—no Greek, still less the Patriarchate, would raise any opposition; but the former is plainly forbidden by the canons and ancient organisation of the Church. The Greek nation opposed the movement, because they realised that the rising of the Bulgarians was only superficially ecclesiastical, while in reality it was fostered in Panslavistic quarters with the object of bringing Hellenic districts under the domination of the Slav.

The Patriarch and the Hellenic nation therefore resisted these claims to the utmost ; and thus, with the aid of Russian policy at Constantinople, was brought about, in 1872, the schism which resulted in the establishment of an independent Bulgarian ecclesiastical government, with its seat at Constantinople.

It is thus clear that it was not the Greeks, but the Panslavists and the Bulgarians, who commenced the quarrel between the Hellenic and Bulgarian elements of those districts of the Turkish Empire which are inhabited by a mixed population.

In continuation and in consequence of the ecclesiastical schism came the Russo-Turkish war of 1877, and the success of the Russian arms was followed by the signature, before the gates of Constantinople, of the Treaty of San Stefano.

In a word, the programme of "Greater Bulgaria" was being put into effect, and the boundaries thereof were already determined (*vide* Art. 6).

After the signature of the Treaty of San Stefano, by which the Hellenic populations of European Turkey were divided off from each other and delivered up to the insatiable appetite of the Slavs, the leading spirit of the Treaty, General Ignatieff, exclaimed with satisfaction, "Now the Greeks will have to swim in order to reach Constantinople."

In fact, nearly all Macedonia, with the exception of a few outlying portions (*e.g.*, the district near Salonica, the Chalcidike peninsula, and the district round Olympus and Pindus), was incorporated in "Greater Bulgaria," which was thus rendered geographically sovereign in the centre of the Balkan Peninsula.*

* PAIX DE SAN-STEFANO.

Article 6.— . . . L'étendue de la principauté de Bulgarie est fixée en traits généraux sur la carte ci-jointe, qui devra servir de base à la délimitation définitive.

En quittant la nouvelle frontière de la principauté serbe, le tracé suivra la limite occidentale du caza de Vrania jusqu'à la chaîne du Karadagh.

Tournant vers l'ouest, la ligne suivra les limites occidentales des cazas de Koumanovo, Kotchani, Kalkandelen jusqu'au mont Korab ; de là par la rivière Veleschitza jusqu'à sa jonction avec le Drine Noir. Se dirigeant vers le sud par le Drine et après par la limite occidentale du caza d'Ochride

Great Britain, however, protested against this treaty, her chief argument being that the national rights of Hellenism were being shamelessly ignored. Owing to English influence, the Treaty of San Stefano was torn to shreds. A European Conference was held at Berlin, and a new era was inaugurated in the Balkan Peninsula, a Bulgarian Principality being created by detaching certain provinces from Turkish rule.

With regard to Greece and the rights of Hellenism, the Conference merely recommended the cession of the Turkish provinces of Epirus and Thessaly to the kingdom of Greece, and the application of a wide system of reform in the island of Crete, then in a state of rebellion against the Porte. It was also resolved that the necessary reforms should be carried out in Macedonia, Thrace, Albania, and Armenia, under the supervision and control of the Great Powers. It is to be noticed that in referring to the provinces of Thrace and Macedonia, Lord Salisbury insisted that "Thrace and Macedonia, as well as Crete, are Greek."

Almost all the decisions of the Great Powers represented at the Berlin Conference were promptly carried into effect, especially as regarded the claims of the Slavs. They had as their champion and protector the Russian

vers le mont Linas, la frontière suivra les limites occidentales des cazas de Gortcha et Starovo jusqu'au mont Grammos. Ensuite, par le lac de Kastoria, la ligne frontière rejoindra la rivière Moglénitza et après avoir suivi son cours et passé au sud de Yanitza (Wardar-Yenidjé) se dirigera par l'embouchure du Wardar et par le Galliko vers les villages de Parga et de Sarai-keui ; de là par le milieu du lac Bechik-guel à l'embouchure des rivières Strouma et Karassou et par la côte maritime jusqu'au Buru-guel ; plus loin, partant dans la direction nord-ouest vers le mont Tchaltépé par la chaîne du Rhodope jusqu'au mont Krouscovo, par les Balkans Noirs (Kara-Balkan) par les monts Eschek Koulatchi, Tchépélion, Karakolas et Tchiklar, jusqu'à la rivière Arda.

De là, la ligne frontière sera tracée dans la direction de la ville de Tchirmen, et, laissant la ville d'Andrinople au midi par les villages de Sugutlion, Kara-Hamja, Arnaoutkeui, Akardji et Enidjé jusqu'à la rivière Tékéderessi. En suivant le cours du Tékéderessi et du Tchorldéréssi jusqu'à Loulé-Bourgas, et de là, par la rivière Soudjakdéré jusqu'au village de Serguen, la ligne frontière ira par les hauteurs directement vers Hakim Tablassi où elle aboutira à la Mer Noire.

Elle quittera la côte maritime près de Mangalia, en longeant les limites meridionales du sandjak de Toultscha et aboutira au Danube au dessus de Rassova.

Government, as was pointed out at the Conference by the noble Marquis who was at that time so skilfully directing the foreign policy of England. The text of his reply to Prince Gortchakoff, who opposed the contention of the British delegates that the independent kingdom of Greece should be represented at the Conference, is given below.*

The truth of Lord Salisbury's statement is, unfortunately, still being confirmed ; but it is yet more regret-

* PROTOCOLE NO. 2—SÉANCE DU 17 JUIN 1878.

Le Marquis de Salisbury : . . . Le Congrès n'ignore pas que pendant ces dernières années les liens d'amitié qui unissaient autrefois les sujets grecs et slaves de la Porte ont été rompus. D'alliés ils sont devenus rivaux. Les slaves, qui reconnaissaient autrefois l'autorité du Patriarche grec, se sont ralliés à une nouvelle organisation ecclésiastique qui a réclamé leur soumission. Dans une grande partie du territoire habité par la race grecque le droit de posséder les églises et les écoles a donné lieu à des constatations, souvent même à des luttes, entre les populations des deux races.

Le conflit s'est profondément aggravé à la suite des événements qui se sont passés pendant ces derniers mois, et les passions engendrées par ces conflits ont de plus en plus éloigné ces deux races l'une de l'autre. Il s'agissait de quelque chose de plus que d'une divergence d'opinion sur la question du régime ecclésiastique. Les grecs redoutent, et avec raison, la subjugation de leur Eglise, la suppression de leur langue et l'absorption et la disparition progressive de leur race, si leurs rivaux se trouvaient dans une position prépondérante.

Cet point sont pour eux d'un intérêt capital et leur sort dépend de la forme que donnera le Congrès aux dispositions qui seront arrêtées dans le but de protéger les Chrétiens et d'assurer l'ordre et la sécurité aux provinces de la Turquie Européenne.

Mais les deux races ne sont pas devant le Congrès sur un pied égal.

Les slaves ont pour défenseur dans cette salle un puissant peuple militaire, leur frère par le sang et par la foi, fort du prestige des victoires récentes.

Les grecs, au contraire, n'ont ici comme représentant aucune nation de même race.

Le Gouvernement de sa Majesté est d'avis que des décisions prises dans ces conditions ne contenteraient pas la race grecque, et par conséquent n'amèneraient ni la tranquillité de l'Empire Ottoman ni la paix de l'Europe.

Il est à craindre que de nouvelles agitations ne surgissent parmi ce peuple profondément dévoué à sa foi et à sa nationalité, qui aura la conviction que l'Europe l'a abandonné et l'a livré à la domination d'une race de laquelle ses sympathies sont tout-à-fait éloignées.

L'Angleterre propose donc que le royaume Hellénique soit admis à remplir ce rôle en faveur des grecs, et à prendre part aux délibérations du Congrès : du moins à assister à toutes les séances dans lesquelles des questions se rattachent aux intérêts de la race grecque seront discutées.

Le Prince Gortchacow : . . . Le Prince Gortchacow déclare donc d'avance qu'il associera même pour les grecs de l'Empire Ottoman une autonomie pareille à celle qui est réclamé pour les slaves. Le but de son Gouverne-

table that after thirty years the Bulgarian population of the Balkan Peninsula should to-day find among their warmest advocates and defenders not only the members of the Secret Council of St. Petersburg, but also that very Government which so zealously defended Hellenic rights both on the Bosphorus and at Berlin; for both Thrace and Macedonia are to-day practically treated as Bulgarian provinces in official documents of the Foreign Office in England.

A year has not yet passed since the statesman who was directing the foreign policy of the British Cabinet categorically expressed his belief in the Bulgarian character of Thrace and Macedonia.

The following extract from a Yellow Book of the French Government, dated January 9, 1905, is a communication made by the French Ambassador in London, M. Cambon, to M. Delcassé, then Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic :

"The Secretary of State, the Marquis of Lansdowne, replied that he would give me a written statement of his views as to the probable solutions, but that he was even now of opinion that the intervention of the Powers should be extended to the vilayets of Adrianople and Jannina, the former comprising the Bulgarian and the latter the Greek population."

I will advance nothing *à priori* with regard to the present crisis in the Balkan Peninsula, which has resulted to a great extent from the selfish policy of some of the European Powers, who merely seek their own political interests. I could adduce many facts, which are confirmed by official Europe itself, clearly showing that the state of anarchy now prevailing in Macedonia is due, partly to the insincere policy of official Europe, and partly to the greedy and criminal activity of the Bulgarian committees, en-

ment est de rapprocher ces deux races. Quant à la question religieuse à la quelle Lord Salisbury a fait allusion, son altesse doit faire remarquer qu'il n'y a point de dissidence religieuse au fond entre le Patriarchat grec et l'Exarchat Bulgare : c'est uniquement une question de liturgie qui a amené la séparation des deux Eglises.

couraged by several European Powers who have an interest in the continuance of this anarchy in the Balkan Peninsula.

It is hardly necessary to repeat that the causes of the conflict between the Christian peoples of Macedonia are neither religious, doctrinal, nor ecclesiastical.

I have already shown, and shall soon again prove, that the Greeks of Macedonia have for some time past been defending their homes against the Bulgarian bands, which are encouraged by the Government of the principality and even commended by a considerable portion of the public opinion of Europe. The Bulgarian Government has taken advantage of this strife between Greeks and Bulgarians to perpetrate by means of the mob the recent abominable outrages on the unfortunate Greeks residing in that country. Of these crimes I have authentic accounts, not only from Greek and other sources, but even from Bulgarian eye-witnesses, whose better feelings revolted at the sight of such atrocities.

I have been hindered by indifferent health from undertaking sooner the cheerless task of attempting to enlighten public opinion in England as to the facts which I have just mentioned. But I now entreat your aid, Sir, in the hope of overcoming the indifference which has been shown in both official and unofficial circles in England to the sufferings of the Greek population under Bulgarian rule.

If the official reports are examined, it will soon appear that it is the duty of Europe to apply pressure in certain quarters with regard to the excesses now being committed in Macedonia. But will it be the agitators in Sofia, or those who are defending their own lives in Macedonia, who will in the end suffer for these atrocities? It is the duty of Europe to consider whether the commission of such crimes is creditable to or permissible by the civilisation which is the white man's burden and pride; crimes which, if committed by yellow, black, or red races, would have called forth the prompt intervention of an international crusade.

The prime object of the Berlin Conference was, first,

to emancipate the Christian peoples suffering under the Turkish yoke, and, secondly, to guarantee the personal freedom of all those populations. Above all, liberty of conscience in religion and education as well as in political and social relations was to be assured to all. In order to attain this end, the necessary measures were taken at the Conference ; and the representatives of the European Powers there assembled showed every desire to respect and protect all the rights of the populations whose conditions were to be ameliorated under the new order. Thus new Bulgaria was created with the obligation to respect the religious and social rights of the different nationalities included in the principality.

The Conference was fully conscious that the old racial and religious differences of the Greeks and Bulgarians would not be terminated by the new order of things. They could not hope that a national hatred whose origin was considerably older than its latest manifestation would be easily forgotten under the pressure of a policy of forcible assimilation—*per fas et nefas*.

As I have already pointed out, the late Lord Salisbury, when attacking the Treaty of San Stefano, based his chief argument on the fate awaiting the Greek inhabitants of the Balkan Peninsula if they were left to the mercy of the insatiable Slavs ; and at Berlin he consistently declared the danger to which the Greek race would be exposed in the newly established principality if its religious and other liberties were not assured.

The words of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs were in every respect prophetic. Notwithstanding the measures adopted by the Conference for their protection, these unfortunate subjects of the Bulgarian Government, who were relieved from the oppression of one tyranny in order to be placed under another, have suffered and are still suffering greater hardships than those which they endured under the domination of the Turks.

This I will proceed to prove, setting down the actual facts in defence of justice and truth.

I

THE BULGARIAN CHARACTER

BEFORE, however, entering upon my narrative, I wish to show you the Bulgarian in his true colours as he is depicted by a number of independent authorities, including some of his own compatriots. I shall cite as witnesses both ancient and modern writers, for the Bulgarian has not in the least changed since the sixth century, when he followed the hordes of the Hunnish chief Attila.

The recently deceased Bulgarian poet Wasoff, in a work entitled "An Obscure Hero," thus addresses his compatriots: "Oh, my people, I shudder when I behold your inhuman countenances brutalised by passions. Bondwomen were the mothers who gave ye birth. The voice of pity is foreign to ye, for cruelty is the element of your life!"

I annex to this poetical outburst the following sketch of the Bulgarian people, taken from the works of the French historian Thierry:

"The Bulgarians, or more correctly Vulgarians, formed the rearguard of the group of Finnish Huns that during the last civil wars had arrived from the depths of Siberia to pitch their tents on the banks of the great river which was then called and is still known in the Tartar dialects as the Athel or Athil, and which took the name of Volga (river of the Vulgars) when the Vulgarians had become established in Europe. It is necessary to return to the fourteenth century, the date of the first Hunnish invasion, in order to find in history an impression of terror and disgust comparable to that excited by these new arrivals

from the northern solitudes, brutish as the wild beasts of the forest in which they had hitherto dwelt. Compared with them, the European Huns, who had been for more than a century in contact with the Romans and Germans, might almost have been called civilised. Their ugliness, squalor, and ferocious instincts seemed to surpass anything hitherto beheld. They destroyed from love of destruction, killed from love of slaughter, and set themselves to blot out every work of man, as if they wished to produce everywhere the similitude of their native wilderness. They are not known to have had either religion or worship, except perhaps the grossly superstitious practice of 'chamanism.' There was something devilish in this hideous people, whose sorcerers, distinguished by their still greater hideousness, pretended with frightful contortions to call up the spirits of the dead. It was said that when posted in a corner of the army during the battle they possessed the art of fascinating, disconcerting, and deluding the enemy by means of fantastic apparitions.

"The Bulgarian, without restraint in his appetites, was endowed with the lubricity of the beast. He was addicted to every vice, and there is one to which he has the infamous glory of having given his own name in nearly every European language. His institutions seemed to have been framed with a view to encourage murder rather than war. None might attain command if he had not first killed an enemy with his own hand. Everything about his mode of warfare, his enormous bow and long arrows, his sword of red copper, and the net in which he enveloped his enemy while running, inspired an involuntary fear and horror. Of all the barbarians who ravaged the Roman Empire, the Bulgarian has been the invader most consistently hated by his contemporaries and most indelibly stigmatised by posterity. And 'accursed of God,' the epithet wrenched by suffering from the Roman peoples of the sixth century, soon became the synonym of the Bulgarian name, and has been consecrated by the use of all subsequent history."

The opinion of the French geographer Réclus about this people does not differ from that advanced by the

author of the "History of Attila." "A number of Bulgarian skulls," he says, "studied by Kopernicki, Virchow, and Beddoe are distinguished by certain characteristics observable among the Australian savages."

A well-known British diplomatist, Sir William White, who ten years later was Ambassador at Constantinople, was in 1875 deputed by the British Government to make a special study of the Bulgarians. The picture he draws of the Bulgarian schoolmaster is especially worthy of remark.

"The teachers," he wrote, "are people educated for the most part in Russia. On their return to their native land they brought with them, besides a superficial learning, some very curious ideas about Panslavism. Their plan was as follows: to destroy as many railway lines as possible, to set fire to the towns of Adrianople and Philippopolis in many places, to burn Sofia and the surrounding villages, to attack the Turkish peasants, to slaughter all the Mussulmans daring to resist, and to pillage their property."

In the period from 1876 to 1906 the political status but not the nature of the ordinary Bulgarian has changed. Education in Bulgaria at the present day is based upon no moral foundation and ruled by the vulgarest materialism. Teachers and pupils alike are swayed by anarchical tendencies. Their books, both on elementary and higher education, have but one object, namely, to inspire the people with savage desires and to accentuate their natural instincts. The training of the Bulgarian pupil is similar to that of the teacher. Mr. Michailovski, one of the *coryphei* of the Bulgarian movement, a professor and a deputy, was obliged to confess in a published work the depravity and degeneracy of the Bulgarian youth owing to such examples. But, in order to give a fuller idea of the Bulgarian soul as it has been shaped and perfected since the establishment of the principality, I append some extracts from the minutes of a meeting of Bulgarian schoolmasters, taken from the Bulgarian journal *Evening Mail*, which appears at Sofia, and is the recognised organ of Bulgarian Liberalism.

“A Bulgarian teacher from Macedonia, graduate of the High School, among other remarks spoke as follows against religious education, advocating its abolition in the schools, and asserting that the demoralisation observable in the schools was largely the result of such teaching :

“‘Religion, instead of forming free citizens, makes hypocritical priests, slaves who influence the heads of Government and the public officials. The hypocritical priest makes the red workman, in order to maintain and feed the priesthood. The study of history shows the evil arising from religion. Religion prepares men for heaven, but not for this world or for a free political life. On this account this cowardly and benighting religion should not be tolerated in our schools to the encouragement of slavery, horror, and moral murder.’

“Another teacher and schoolmaster asked the meeting, ‘Which religion is the right one? There are many religions in Bulgaria—the Mohammedan, Jewish, Catholic, Protestant, Gypsy, and Orthodox. How can the teacher give instruction in the face of such a variety of religions? It is still an open question as to which religion is the best and most correct, and on this account no religious education, but only moral instruction, should be given in our schools. He who desires religion may teach it to his children at home, but not in the school. The fearful word “religion” must never be heard in our schools.’

“These remarks were applauded by the meeting.

“The crusade against religion goes further. Another teacher proclaimed that ‘it is depraved and immoral to tell children that a god formed the first woman from a rib of the first man Adam.’ A colleague added that “it is a shame that Bulgaria in the twentieth century believes the lies of the priesthood. This evil must be expelled from Bulgarian schools. It is a shame and an infamy for us to continue to suffer such uncleanness, such a soulless essence, such a reeking God. This bloodthirsty Jewish God must be turned out of the Bulgarian schools. If religion is left in our schools, everywhere will be seen the priest, the ecclesiastic,

censor, foul ministers of a foul God, and nothing more."

Another Bulgarian teacher, applauding these infamies, asked, among other questions, "What liberty or brotherhood can exist among the citizens with so heavy a chain as religion? If man cannot exist without religion, it is better for him to adopt the Mohammedan religion, for this affords greater liberty than the Christian."

Those differing from the speaker did not dare to protest, as the majority, or two-thirds of those present, would not permit the slightest objection. Thus two-thirds of the schoolmasters and teachers of one department of Bulgaria proclaimed themselves against all religious instruction and on behalf of atheism.

From such moral and spiritual materials has been formed the present principality—that State which, according to enthusiastic admirers of the Bulgarian idea, was to prove a model for the degenerate races of Eastern Europe, the Greeks, Albanians, Servians, and Turks, and was compared to Piedmont, and Prussia, and more recently to Japan!

I do not care to give the names of their admirers. With some of them I am personally acquainted, and I am not so ungrateful as to forget the interest in the welfare of the Greek nation which they showed until quite recently. I would only ask them to examine contemporaneous Bulgarian history, social, political, and national, and to observe impartially the recent events in Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia, of which I shall further on give a faithful account, based upon evidence from both Bulgarian and foreign sources, on the personal testimony of Europeans entirely unconnected with the Greek nation. I invite them to say in what way the Bulgarians of Asparvuch, of Crumm, and of the Tsar Simeon differ from the twentieth century Bulgarians of Stambouloff and Prince Ferdinand.

Three years ago, at the time of the unprovoked outrages perpetrated by the Bulgarians in many parts of Thrace and Macedonia, a French journalist, who during his stay in Macedonia had studied and analysed the

Bulgarian character, wrote that "not Canaris or Garibaldi, but Ravachol, is the true hero in the eyes of the Bulgarian."

M. Pressensé also, who has so often pleaded the cause of Bulgaria in the columns of the Paris *Temps* and in the French Chamber, as well as at meetings in Paris and London, and who has disputed every Greek claim to Macedonia, was compelled after the commission of these atrocities to give the following advice in the Parisian organ just mentioned :

"The Turkish Government should bind the necks of these dynamitards, not with ropes, but with the ribbon of the Osmanieh, for they have rendered it invaluable service. The bombs of the revolutionaries of Salonica have laid the ghost of heroic Macedonia, which for a few moments moved the world.

"Behind the patriot Europe has descried the anarchist and the savage. The spell is broken."

Such, then, is the moral physiognomy of the Bulgarian of to-day, considered as a man and as a citizen.

Have you, Sir, ever investigated the causes and circumstances of the assassinations of Major Panitza of the Bulgarian army, of Dimitroff, of Veltzeff, and of Stambouloff? An inquiry of this kind would well repay the honest and impartial investigator, and might make the European nations regret their pet creation in Eastern Rumelia of the so-called Bulgarian State, which has nothing better to show, after thirty years of political life, than crimes and *coups d'état*, unless, indeed, in the eyes of civilised Europe the most desirable characteristic in the evolution of a people is not a regard for the most precious interests of humanity, but mere military power and unscrupulous force.

II

THE PERSECUTION OF HELLENISM IN BULGARIA AND EASTERN RUMELIA

THE government of new Bulgaria was at first entrusted to Russian organisers, until the German Prince Alexander of Battenberg was appointed Governor.

The young Prince possessed great political and military qualifications, as well as a proportionate ambition, and was able in a very short time to reawaken the military ardour of his subjects, to form their military character, and within seven years to create a military force strong enough to attract the sympathy and inspire the confidence of Europe. Those very same Powers which, seven years previously, had opposed the idea of the Greater Bulgaria as sketched by the Treaty of San Stefano now incited the ambitious Prince to occupy Philippopolis, and to join under his rule the two Bulgarias, *i.e.*, that properly so called and Eastern Rumelia, the population of which consisted of Greeks, Bulgarians, and Turks.

This *coup d'état* was opportune, directed as it was against that Europe which had at Berlin arranged all the affairs of this land in a different manner. The Greek element, in some degree free, vigorously resisted Bulgarianism in all the chief towns of the semi-independent principality—at Philippopolis, Stenimachos, Pyrgos, Anchialos, and elsewhere—and there was some hope that, owing to its superior intellectual power, it would regain its former ascendancy, part of the Mohammedan section having emigrated, while the rest were tranquilly toiling in the rural districts of the country. Once the Bulgarians awoke to what was happening, they hastened

to occupy Eastern Rumelia and to annex it to the Bulgarian principality.

The England of 1885 had forgotten the England of 1878, and thrown over her generous defence of the rights of the Greek population in the Balkans. The *coup d'état* of Philippopolis brought about the very state of things which the Marquis of Salisbury had so vigorously denounced. And in recognising the *fait accompli*, England agreed to sacrifice the Greeks of that country to the ambition of the Bulgarians and the rapacity of Pan-slavism. The Prince of Bulgaria, at the instance of the representatives of the Great Powers at Constantinople, and especially of the English Ambassador, was recognised by the Sultan's Government as Vali of Eastern Rumelia.

In his Memoirs, published a few years ago, Elias Tsaneff, a Bulgarian diplomat, at that time representing the principality at Constantinople, writes as follows regarding the support afforded him at Constantinople by the representative of Great Britain :

“The representatives of England and Italy more than once congratulated me on the second and third terms of the agreement.* The former described them as ‘splendid,’ and the latter as ‘an unhoped-for success.’

“Sir W. White, the British Ambassador, took great pains to arrange that the appointment of the Governor

* The second and third terms of the agreement were as follows: *Article 2*.—So long as his Highness shall observe a policy of order and loyalty toward the Suzerain, and shall devote his efforts to the maintenance of order and safety in the province, as well as to the welfare of the population of Eastern Rumelia, his appointment as General Governor will be directly ratified by H.M. the Sultan, in virtue of a firman, to be renewed after the expiration of five years, as provided in the seventeenth Article of the same Treaty. *Article 3*.—So long as the Government of Eastern Rumelia and that of the principality of Bulgaria shall be in the hands of one and the same person, the Ottoman Government shall divide off from Eastern Rumelia and govern directly the Mussulman villages of the province of Kartzali, and also the Mussulman villages known to exist on the mountains of Rhodope which have hitherto been left without this province, and this in exchange for the right of the Imperial Government, as given in paragraph 1 of the fifteenth Article of the Berlin Treaty. The definition of the boundaries of this province and of the aforesaid villages shall be effected by a committee appointed by the Sublime Porte and Prince Alexander, the strategic points being reserved for the benefit of the Imperial Government.

should be for life, but in this he was unsuccessful. So much the better, for by such an appointment the personal union is very clearly defined. He intended to make another attempt, but, after a careful examination of the question, he informed me that his Government would also agree to the modification on which the other Powers had decided."

These facts clearly illustrate the inconsistency of European diplomacy.

The Russian Government, although it feigned discontent, was inwardly pleased. But when after an interval the Prince of Bulgaria, the hero of Slivnitza, began to manifest anti-Russian sentiments, and declined to be made the tool of Russian policy in the Balkans, he was expelled by a conspiracy which was supported by Russian agents, and was compelled to abdicate.

On the recognition of the new status, the Bulgarians, understanding that the policy of Europe was on their side, commenced an unrelenting persecution of everything Greek in the country. The Greeks were practically placed outside the law; schools and churches were closed, and even the use of the Greek language itself was expressly proscribed.

This oppression of the national conscience is still being carried on openly and under the very eyes of the European representatives. There was a pre-arranged plan to crush the force of Hellenism in Eastern Rumelia, and the plan has been successfully inaugurated.

The Bulgarians do not hesitate to interfere, if not officially at least socially, and with the aid of what political devices come to their hand, even in marriages between Greeks, and they attempt to break up Greek families by practically forcing at least one Bulgarian into each household.

Innumerable examples could be cited, but I shall confine myself to an instance which occurred a short time ago at Philippopolis, and which illustrates the Bulgarian's cynical repudiation of every ordinance, human or divine.

A notable Greek resident of Philippopolis, one of the wealthiest inhabitants of the capital of Eastern Rumelia, directed in his will that none of his daughters should marry a Bulgarian under pain of being disinherited.

In spite of this, every one of his daughters was compelled, whether so disposed or not, to espouse a Bulgarian husband.

The relatives dared not protest against these marriages, as the Bulgarian bridegrooms, having the support of the authorities, would in any case have succeeded in preventing the terms of the will being put into execution by the Bulgarian courts. In this manner one of the best Greek families of Philippopolis, or indeed of Eastern Rumelia, was extinguished.

This incident does not stand alone. Woe to the Greek father who refuses his consent to the marriage of his daughter with an influential Bulgarian. His family would be extirpated, *pour encourager les autres*. The Bulgarian hatred of Greeks sometimes touches the absurd. In the town of Pyrgos, almost entirely inhabited by Greeks, there is a coffee-house called the "Anti-Hellenism," which every true Bulgarian is found to frequent.

Within hearing of the police the Bulgarian mob sing their most insulting and provocative songs, the favourite being one which refers to the slaughter of the Greeks and the subversion of their independence.

At every moment the Greek is in danger of his life. In Philippopolis Greeks are unable to leave their houses at night, and if by chance they should have to remain out later than usual, they must take their lives in their hands.

During a few days spent at Philippopolis in the summer of 1902 the following episode, which is characteristic of the condition of the common rights enjoyed by the Greek residents of Bulgaria, was related to me.

The boys at the Greek school of this town had been giving an exhibition of gymnastics, which was held officially before the Greek notables and the members of

the community, the Bulgarian authorities being also invited to attend.

The exhibition proved a success ; the pupils attracted the attention of all the spectators, by their manly bearing and gymnastic efficiency, and on the following day one of the local newspapers published an article referring to the success of the exhibition, and speaking in high terms of the results. This was apparently sufficient to concentrate the jealousy and animosity of the Bulgarians upon the unfortunate writer of the article, one of the professors at the Greek school, who the same night was murderously attacked in a coffee-house in the centre of the town.

To a protest on the part of the leaders of the Greek community the Governor of the town replied in the most casual manner : " Were you not afraid openly to hold such a pretentious entertainment ? Do you think you would be allowed to do that if you were in Turkey ? " Whereupon a member of the deputation appropriately reminded the representative of the law that he was mistaken if he regarded them as *rayahs*, since by the statutory law of Eastern Rumelia all its inhabitants, irrespective of their nationality, had the same rights, of which no one could legally deprive the Greek population.

The Governor appeared to yield, but none of the offenders were punished ; and the result of this regrettable incident was that the victim of the attack was compelled hastily to leave Bulgarian territory, in order to avoid experiencing on his person any further manifestations of Bulgarian fanaticism.

There is at present one law for the Bulgarian and another for the Greek ; and unless the proper measures are taken in time by the European Powers responsible for the establishment of the political status in Bulgaria, the Greek population of Bulgaria will soon be annihilated.

I extract the following edifying paragraph from a Bulgarian journal issued at Sofia, the *Zapadna Bolgaria* :

“The winter evening receptions have commenced at the Military Club of Philippopolis. Amongst the guests the chief places are usually occupied by Greeks and Jews, and the language spoken at the club is Greek. We are not aware that preference is given in any other club to these two loathsome elements. It is, however, a consolation that, if our information is correct, all the officers with one accord signed in the books of the club a protest against the invitation of Jews and Greeks; and only Messrs. Doloff and Botseff, who issue the objectionable invitations, refuse to agree with the entire body of the officers of the Guard, and persist in their affection for Palestine and Athens respectively. Happy Greeks! to number Bulgarian colonels among the agents of Hellenism!”

Last winter a distinguished Greek who was valiantly vindicating the national rights of his compatriots in Bulgaria had his name removed from the books of the club, on the ground that he had, in the newspaper the *Philippopolis*, of which he was the editor, published articles condemning the exploits of Bulgarian brigands in Macedonia.

But perhaps the following words of another Greek journalist, the editor of the *Balkan News*, will convey a better idea of the ingenious oppression of the Government of Eastern Rumelia :

“Our churches, our schools, our property, and our professions are in the hands of the lowest type of Bulgarian fanaticism. You build a school, and if you do not allow the Bulgarian contractor to build it as he likes, and at the price he demands, you run the risk of losing it altogether, for he will move heaven and earth to have it confiscated on the pretence that it is built on Bulgarian ground. You let to the meanest Bulgarian a house belonging to the community, and if you venture to request him to leave, in order that you may have it repaired, or if you hand it over to some poor but orthodox priest or layman, the

man at once allies himself with the Bulgarian priests and parish in order to seize the property. You try to exercise your profession or trade in order to extend your business, and at once the committee for the assessment of taxes will ruin you by a most exorbitant and unconscionable tax, because you happen to be a Greek; in the law courts, witnesses and even lawyers endeavour to influence the judges, and openly maintain that in a case between a Greek and a Bulgarian, the preference *ceteris paribus* must be given to the latter. We Greeks pay school rates to the amount of 100,000 levies, yet the Government gives not one centime to our schools, but expends this tax, which we pay by the sweat of our brows, in subsidising Bulgarian, Turkish, Jewish, and Armenian schools. At Stenimachos no Greek can be elected mayor, notwithstanding the Greek majority in that town. Dr. Tatartzief, a member of the so-called "Internal Organisation" to which the Greeks attribute the crimes committed in Macedonia, is no sooner arrested at Athens than a crusade is here commenced against us who are completely innocent in the affair. Greek physicians are expelled from the medical societies, many Greeks are dismissed from the army, and others are persecuted in other ways. And why? Because Dr. Tatartzief has been illegally arrested at Athens; because Dr. Tatartzief is, as he himself declared at Athens, a member of no revolutionary party in Macedonia, in spite of the fact that Dr. Tatartzief represented himself before Count Lamsdorf, the Russian Minister, as one of the leading members of the notorious "Internal Organisation." We ask for justice, we ask for those rights which not even the Turks or other more barbarous people deny to their subjects, we ask from the Bulgarian what the Bulgarian himself asks when abroad: we ask for our Church and school, and for the equal dispensation of justice to all; we ask not to be considered as pariahs, and not to be at the mercy of any adventurer, brigand, or assassin. . . . The Bulgarians do not seize the monasteries of Pyrgos, Varna, Stenimachos, and Cavacli, or the

churches and properties belonging to these monasteries at Mesemvria, Philippopolis, Stenimachos, Ferdinandovo, and Chaskovo, because they are monasteries and churches, or because they are valuable property which they require, but because they are Greek. These seizures are no ordinary acts of robbery; they are part of a plan which aims at the gradual but complete extirpation of the Greek element in Bulgaria."

The programme for the annihilation of the Greek element in the Balkan Peninsula is complete, and the worst crimes perpetrated in its execution were justified and countenanced by the Russian Minister just mentioned when he condescended to receive Dr. Tatartzief, the notorious representative in Macedonia of the "Internal Organisation" (*i.e.*, known as the "Assassination Committee of Sofia"), which has filled Macedonia with devastation and horror.

And what can the Greeks do? Shall they yield after so many centuries? Must they emigrate? No! It is their duty to struggle and to protest, in the hope that they may overcome and get back their own in the day when European policy is guided and controlled by force of truth and in the interests of justice.

If the Greeks in the principality continue to struggle against Bulgarian tyranny, hoping for a more favourable future, the Mohammedans have found it better to abandon Bulgarian territory in despair. The emigration of the Mohammedan population is very heavy, in spite of the fact that the Prince of Bulgaria, Governor-General of Eastern Rumelia, is under the suzerainty of the Sultan.

"At Philippopolis, on Christmas Eve, the door of the Turkish mosque was broken open; the lamps, candlesticks, and candles were broken to pieces and thrown on the ground. The authors of this outrage were proved to be soldiers, who were arrested. The Bulgarian judges, however, chose to treat them as children under

age, and Bulgarian justice refrained from punishing them." *

"A muezzin chanting from the minaret was jeered at, and a worthy Bulgarian, Drensky by name, handed over the delinquent to a gendarme, who, after holding him by the hand and accompanying him a few steps, saluted him and departed."

"The glass windows of the mosques were broken with stones. The offenders were denounced to the court, but no steps were taken against them by the latter."

No wonder the Turk emigrates.

A whole book could be written about the moral worth and character of Bulgarian rule in this part of the Balkan Peninsula. The persecution of every Christian person not belonging to the ruling race has become quite customary. Bulgarian audacity increases from day to day, and at no very distant date a general exodus will be ordered or enforced of all the non-Bulgarian populations of the principality, Greek or Mussulman.

History will record this crime of forcible expatriation among the liabilities of the Berlin Treaty and of the *coup d'état* of Philippopolis, which received the benign sanction of civilised Europe.

Before concluding the history of the persecution of Hellenism in Eastern Rumelia, I may be permitted to repeat the account of an incident which is very characteristic of the state of affairs in that country, and which I have received from very safe sources.

In the town of Mesemvria, situated on the Black Sea, in Eastern Rumelia, inhabited almost entirely by Greeks, Greek schools have existed for centuries. There are no Bulgarians in Mesemvria, but nevertheless a boys' school is kept in full swing, together with an infants' school.

The inhabitants of Mesemvria being poor, are not able to support an infants' school, and can scarcely provide for the boys' school.

It will be readily understood that the Greeks in this way submitted to a course of compulsory Bulgarisation.

* This and the succeeding extracts are taken from a local newspaper.

The Bulgarians have not made a road for years, in order to keep the Greek population isolated and poor, whilst they are of course forced to pay road taxes regularly, on pain of flogging.

This information is derived from a respectable Greek merchant of this town; but the picture would not be complete without the relation of the following episode, which clearly shows the manner in which, under the ægis of the Bulgarian Government, Bulgarian ideas are propagated among the Greek population of that country.

In 1898, on May 11, the *fête* of the Slav apostles, Cyril and Methodios, a commemoration was held at the Bulgarian school of Mesemvria.

The religious ceremony was followed by a speech delivered by the head-master, who dwelt upon the significance of the day for Bulgarians.

After this the little Greek children of the school sang songs and recited poems, all of course in Bulgarian, extolling the heroism of the Bulgarians against their hereditary and only enemies, the Greeks.

According to these accounts, when the hordes of Crumm and of Simeon the Great, the "Terror of Byzantium," marched up to the walls of Constantinople, the Greek Emperor came out, and, falling on his knees before the Bulgarian leader, begged him to take his gold, but to spare his throne, &c. &c.

After this, one of the schoolmistresses, the powerful *protégée* of a young Bulgarian officer, rose and gave the finishing touch to the insults heaped upon the Greeks by an abusive speech ("swindlers" and "unprincipled" being among the terms she applied to them); and her pupils, are all Greek children, with the exception of those of two or three Government officials, and even these are born of Greek mothers.

As I have already pointed out, the Berlin Conference, in assuring religious and intellectual freedom to the populations freed from Turkish rule, paid especial attention to the safeguarding of these rights by means of the following regulations of the Berlin Treaty and of the Organic Statute of Eastern Rumelia.

These provisions assure :

“In localities where the Bulgarians are intermingled with Turkish, Roumanian, Greek, or other populations, the rights and interests of these populations shall be taken into account as regards elections and the working of the Constitution.”—Berlin Treaty, Art. 4, § 2.

And Article 5, § 2 and § 3, of the same Treaty adds :

“Difference of religious creed or confession shall not be brought against any one as a reason either for exclusion from the enjoyment of civil and political rights, or for ineligibility for admission to the public services, functions, or honours, or to the exercise of the various professions and industries in any locality whatever.”

The liberty and public practice of every religion are assured to all subjects of Bulgaria, as well as to foreigners, and no let or hindrance shall be laid on the ecclesiastical organisation of the different communions or on their relations with their spiritual heads.

“We, Commissioners of the Powers, the signatories of the Treaty drawn up at Berlin on the 13th of July, 1878, proclaim and certify that the Organic Statute containing the aforesaid conditions was drawn up and voted by us, agreeably to the eighteenth article of the aforesaid Treaty.

“In witness whereof we have signed the present Organic Statute and have thereto affixed our seals.

“At Constantinople : 14/26 April, 1879.

4th of Djemagi-ul-ebel, 1286.

“(Signed) ASSIM, AVREAU, VON BRAUNSCHWEIG,
KALLAY, RINGKOUTOULY, HENRY
DRUMMOND WOLFF, BERNONI,
TSERETEFF.

“For an exact copy :

“ROZET, SELIM, COURIEL.”

As it is only by the perusal of the respective provisions of this Organic Statute that the magnitude of the wrongs committed against the subject Greek population by the Bulgarians can be understood, as well as the supreme contempt shown by them for the enactments and decisions of Europe, whose aid they yet continue to invoke, I think it not inadvisable to append those provisions which relate to the rights of the orthodox Greek population in Eastern Rumelia :

ORGANIC STATUTE OF EASTERN RUMELIA.

Concerning the Rights of Citizens.

“ *Art. 24.* Citizens of Eastern Rumelia, without distinction of race or religion, enjoy the same rights.

“ They are also eligible for all public employments and honours in proportion to their capacity and worth.

“ *Art. 25.* Public employment shall be distributed with justice, the opinion of the majority of the inhabitants of the different districts being taken into consideration in the election of civil officers.

“ *Art. 30.* Every citizen shall enjoy personal freedom. No one shall be prosecuted, arrested, imprisoned, or subjected to any restriction of his freedom, unless it be in the cases provided by law and according to the prescribed formalities.

“ *Art. 31.* Every one shall have access to his lawful judge. The formation of special committees to judge penal cases is forbidden.

“ *Art. 32.* The home of every citizen of Eastern Rumelia shall be inviolable. The authorities are not allowed to enter it of their own accord, unless it be according to the prescribed formalities and in cases provided for by law.”

Concerning Language.

“ *Art. 22.* The chief languages of the country—Turkish, Bulgarian, and Greek—shall be used in the Government, both by the authorities and by private persons in their relations with the latter, according to the following rules :

“The administrative and judicial authorities of departments, provinces, and districts, in official acts, in verdicts of the courts of justice, in correspondence and publications, shall make use of the language of that population which is in the majority in the respective district, unless the minority of the inhabitants be at least equal to the half of this majority.

“In the latter case the language of the minority in question is entitled to be as much used as that of the aforesaid majority.

“The administrative and judicial authorities, both central and provincial, in their correspondence with the lower authorities dependent on them shall use the language spoken by the majority of the inhabitants in the districts of the lower authorities in question.

“Turkish shall be the official language of Eastern Rumelia in its relations with the Sublime Porte and the other parts of that Empire.

“The laws which shall hereafter be published in the capital, the ordinances, circulars, and publications of the General Governor, as well as those of the General Secretary and the General Directors, which affect the whole toparchy shall be drawn up in the Turkish, Bulgarian, and Greek languages.

“In the courts of justice the citizens shall have the right to make use of any one of the three chief languages, as they please.

“Any verdict of any court whatsoever shall be translated officially into whichever of the three languages shall be chosen by the party interested, at whose request the translation shall be made.

“*Art. 75, § 4.* Fifteen years after the promulgation of the Organic Statute, every one who, being of age, shall claim the exercise of political rights, must, in addition to the aforesaid conditions, be able to read and write in one of the above three languages.

“*Art. 97.* Every member of the Government Assembly may use in his speeches, notes, proposals, and documents relating to the discharge of his duties, one of the three aforesaid languages.”

Concerning Education and Schools.

“*Art. 38.* Education shall be free. The liberty of education shall be exercised according to the regulations concerning ability and morals as prescribed by law and under the supervision of the authorities as regards morality, public order, and respect for the laws of the State.

“*Art. 39.* Every one shall have the right to express his opinions verbally, in writing, or in print, provided he comply with the laws.

“*Art. 344.* The different communities shall be obliged to provide the expenses which are at present charged to them with regard to the maintenance of their educational and benevolent institutions.

“*Art. 347.* The expenses for the establishment and maintenance of the lower and higher schools are at the charge of the religious communities.

“The internal and special management of schools, with the appointment of teachers, shall belong to the religious community which provides the expenses.

“*Art. 348.* Should any of the communities not dispose of the necessary funds for the establishment and maintenance of primary as well as of secondary schools, where the latter are considered necessary, a special subsidy may be given to the said community with the assent of the central authorities of the Government.

“*Art. 349.* In addition, in every yearly Budget a certain sum shall be set aside for aid to schools.

“The distribution of the said sum shall be made by a regulation of the public service, and it shall be made in such a way that the subsidies offered to the religious communities, according to the previous and the present Articles, should as nearly as possible correspond to the proportions in which these communities participate in the charges of the Central Government.

“*Art. 356.* The chief supervision of the establishments of public instruction and private schools shall belong to the Director of Public Instruction, who shall exercise it in conformity with the laws and regulations through

a sufficient number of inspectors appointed in each province.

“These inspectors shall be chosen from the notables of the religious community whose schools they are to inspect.

“*Art. 359.* No religious community shall be forced to introduce into its schools other than its own language.

“*Art. 360.* Every community may introduce into its schools the teaching of those languages which it may deem useful, and it may in addition allow the use of these languages for the teaching of the lessons in the school.”

*Concerning Religious Liberty, Clergy,
and Religious Communities.*

“*Art. 28.* Every person shall freely profess his own religion, and shall enjoy the same protection on the part of the authorities in the exercise of his worship. . . .

“*Art. 29.* Nobody shall be forced to take part in any way in the practices and ceremonies of any religion, or to keep its holidays.

“*Art. 335.* The religious communities which already legally exist in Eastern Rumelia shall preserve the rights, exemptions from taxes, privileges, and liberties which they enjoyed before the war.

“*Art. 337.* The clergy of the different creeds shall on no account be deprived in Eastern Rumelia of the honours and precedence which were granted them by the Sultans.

“*Art. 338.* The ecclesiastics, pilgrims, and monks of all nationalities who shall travel or temporarily reside in Eastern Rumelia shall enjoy the same advantages as those possessed by the native members of that body to which they belong.

“*Art. 339.* The regulations of *Art. 62* of the Berlin Treaty, concerning the protection of the persons mentioned in the foregoing Article, and their religious and benevolent institutions, shall equally be applicable to Eastern Rumelia.

“*Art. 69.* The mufti, the spiritual heads of the five

Christian denominations, and the chief rabbi residing in the capital shall be, by virtue of their position, members of the Government Assembly.

“*Art. 106.* The heads of the religious communities, who are members of the Government Assembly, and who are not members of the permanent committee of ten, have the right to take part, by a consultative vote, in those discussions of the committee which concern the interests of their particular community.

“The president of the permanent committee shall give notice of such discussions at least three days beforehand to the heads of the religious communities concerned, under penalty of the annulment of the resolutions which may have been arrived at during their absence.

“*Art. 125.* Each department shall have a general council, which shall elect from its members a departmental committee. This council shall consist of the members who by right take part in it, namely, of the heads of the three most numerous religious communities of the department. In the department of Philippopolis the heads of the four most numerous communities shall take part in the council. . . .

“*Art. 183.* In each rural district of which all the inhabitants belong to the same religious community there shall be a mayor and a municipal coadjutor.

“*Art. 184.* In the rural districts the inhabitants of which are divided among two or more communities so many sections shall be established as there are communities. Each section shall have one mayor, and in case of need one municipal coadjutor, both of which it shall elect independently.

“*Art. 187.* For each section of any rural district a council of elders shall be formed, the members of which shall be not less than four and not more than twelve, according to the importance of the district.

“The imauns and the religious chiefs of the non-Mussulman communities shall by virtue of their position be members of the council of elders of their respective communities.”

Concerning the Property of Religious Communities.

“*Art. 341.* Those religious communities which are legally existent in Eastern Rumelia shall retain their movable and landed property.

“This landed property shall only be confiscated for reasons of public advantage properly verified, in the instance and manner provided by law, after a previous equitable indemnity.

“The communities in question shall not be deprived of their movable property, except as a means of satisfying some higher requirement of public health.

“*Art. 342.* The religious communities shall continue to collect, with the aid and protection of the public authorities, the contributions in their favour sanctioned by custom. . . . The proceeds of such contributions shall not be taxed.

“*Art. 343.* The buildings devoted to education, to philanthropic ends, and the residences of the members of the different clergy, either in the town or in the country, shall also enjoy freedom from taxation, as well as the enclosures in which the said buildings and houses are situated.

“The same privilege shall be accorded in respect of the furniture of the buildings devoted to worship, public education, or any philanthropic purpose, as well as to those intended for the use of the clergy or any other persons, and which belong to the service of any religious, educational, or philanthropic establishment, in virtue of any title whatsoever.

“*Art. 486, § 1.* Property affording a revenue which is managed directly or let for any period determined by the religious communities, either Mussulman or non-Mussulman, or by religious, educational, or benevolent institutions, whether Mussulman or non-Mussulman, shall remain the property of the communities or of these institutions. . . .

“§ 2. The aforesaid landed property, and that designed for the residence of the priests and ministers of the dif-

ferent recognised religions, shall not be liable either to confiscation or mortgage.

“§ 3. Landed property affording a revenue which is neither managed directly nor let for any period determined by the religious communities, Mussulman or non-Mussulman, or by the religious, educational, or benevolent institutions, Mussulman or non-Mussulman, on which they depend, shall become the free property of the present legal proprietors or of their assignees, who shall be obliged to indemnify the said religious communities, Mussulman or other, or the said religious, scholastic, or benevolent institutions, Mussulman or other.

“§ 4. This compensation will be paid under the superintendence of the Central Government, according to the following forms and conditions :

“§ 5. The amount of compensation payable to the religious communities, Mussulman or other, or to the religious, scholastic, or benevolent institutions, Mussulman or other, shall be determined for each landed property by the capitalisation of the yearly revenue paid by the property, whatever the nature and description of this revenue may be, with the addition of the estimated value of the right of re-acquisition of the estate, calculated in proportion to the estimated right of transfer, in favour of the religious community, or the religious, educational, or philanthropic institution, Mussulman or other, in case of confiscation of this property by legacy, sale, &c.

“§ 6. The indemnity mentioned in the foregoing paragraph shall be a round sum which, expressed in gold piastres, shall be divisible by a hundred.

“§ 7. The religious community, Mussulman or other, or the religious, scholastic, or philanthropic institution, Mussulman or other, which is to be indemnified shall receive until the indemnity thus fixed be paid off (in instalments of 100, 500, 1000, and 10,000 gold piastres) bonds to bearer, which will carry fixed interest and be accepted in all the Stock Exchanges of the Empire.

“As regards the consecrated landed property, or legacies to mosques, which have a special executor, these bonds will be delivered to the said executor.

“As regards those which are administered either by the Minister of Mosque Property at Constantinople, or by the Patriarchate, or by the Bulgarian Exarchy, or any other ecclesiastical authority, these bonds shall be delivered to the said Minister or other aforesaid authority, the principal and interest of each bond being guaranteed to the bearer, first by the Treasury of the Central Government, and secondly by the whole of the released landed property, and thirdly and more especially by the landed estate for the liberation of which the said bond will be given.

“§ 20. In every department a committee will be formed, under the presidency of a special official, and commissioned (1st) To register all consecrated landed property or legacies to mosques, as well as the amount of the debts owed by each; (2nd) to fix the amount of indemnity to be given in the form of bonds to the religious communities, Mussulman and other, as well as to the religious, scholastic, or philanthropic institutions, Mussulman or other; (3rd) to determine the amount of the contributions payable by the owners of the liberated landed estates in conformity with par. 9.

“§ 40. Against these resolutions an appeal can be made before the Chancery Court.”

Concerning Property in General.

“*Art. 36.* All property is inviolable. No person can be deprived of his property except for reasons of public advantage, duly verified in the cases and with the formalities prescribed by law, and after previous equitable indemnity.

“*Art. 37.* Public sequestration of property is forbidden in Eastern Rumelia.

“The property of persons convicted by law of contumacy, whether before or after condemnation, cannot be put under sequestration.”

Final Regulation.

“*Art. 495.* The present Organic Statute cannot be modified unless it be in consequence of an understanding between the Sublime Porte and the other Powers, signatories of the Berlin Treaty, concluded on July 13, 1878, with the exception of the Articles included in chapters 12 and 13 (concerning gendarmerie and the municipal guard), in the case of which this same Constitution provides that they can be changed by law of the Central Government.”

Unfortunately, all these regulations, which bear the sanction and guarantee of official Europe, and are worthy of the liberal spirit of our times, have been, from the recognition of the most elementary rights upwards, violated by the Bulgarian authorities.

They had been practically abrogated by them for some time, but at the time of the recent outrages in Eastern Rumelia the Bulgarian Government openly joined hands with the mob.

Persecution of the Greek Church.

The persecution of the Greek language, the seizure of Greek schools, and the dismissal of Greek officials did not suffice the Bulgarians, and they have since directed their attacks against the Greek Church.

In direct contravention of Art. 5 § 3 of the Berlin Treaty, and Art. 24, 28, 34 and, 35 of the Organic Statute, they have systematically carried out seizures of churches and monasteries.

The following is an abridged list of such seizures, divided into districts.

I.—Ecclesiastical District of Varna.

1. Church of the Holy Trinity.
2. Church of St. Athanasios (village of Castritsi).
3. The church of the village Kara Hussein.

4. Extensive lands and a small wood near the village of Soutsoukli, the property of the church of SS. Peter and Paul.

5. The monastery of St. Constantine, near Varna, together with the church and accessory buildings and 120 hectares of land from which the Greek community of Varna derived a yearly revenue of 5000 francs.

6. The monastery of St. Demetrios, near Varna, with the lands and vineyards appertaining thereto, from which also the Greek community derived an income of 5000 francs.

II.—*Ecclesiastical District of Philippopolis.*

7. Church of the Virgin at Philippopolis, which has been converted by the Bulgarians into their cathedral.

8. Church of the Archangelos at Chaskioi, together with the property of this community situated in Philippopolis and the whole of the property of this church.

9. Church of St. Fotini at Dermenderé.

10. Church of St. Athanasios at Stenimachos.

11. Church of Zoodochos Pighi, in the same town, together with all the property of this church.

12. The large Patriarchal monastery of Batskovo which directly depended upon the Œcumenical Patriarchate, and which was reserved for the Patriarchate and the orthodox Greeks by Art. 10 of the Imperial Firman, dated February 27, 1870, regulating the differences between the Patriarchate and the Bulgarian Exarchate.

13. The rich and extensive lands of this monastery.

14. Church of St. Kyriaki at Philippopolis.

15. Monastery of the Holy Trinity at Kavakli.

16. The appurtenances of the church of St. George at Stenimachos.

III.—*Ecclesiastical District of Anchialos and Mesemvria.*

17. The monastery of St. Anastasia Pharmacolytria, dependent on the Œcumenical Patriarchate, together with all the property of the monastery.

18. The Byzantine churches of St. George and St. Anargyroi, which were restored to their rightful owners only after the spirited protest of the Œcumenical Patriarch and the Greek Government.

In Philippopolis, Stenimachos, and the Environs of these Two Towns.—I. Churches.

At Philippopolis : (a) St. Marina, the cathedral, which has been re-dedicated to Saint Tsar Boris, confiscated, together with the archbishop's palace ; (b) St. Charalambos, re-dedicated to the Prophet Elias, and confiscated ; (c) St. Demetrios and (d) St. Constantine, both confiscated and re-dedicated to St. Alexander Nevsky and St. Euthymios respectively ; (e) St. Dionysios, a private chapel, which has since been restored to the community.

At Stenimachos : (a) Holy Trinity, confiscated ; (b) St. George (since restored) ; (c) Holy Virgin, confiscated ; (d) St. Nicholas, confiscated.

At Tatar-Bazartzik : (a) Metamorphosis, confiscated and re-dedicated to SS. Cyril and Methodios.

At Peristera : (a) Holy Virgin, confiscated.

At Kuklena : (a) St. Athanasios, confiscated ; (b) St. Theodore, confiscated.

II. *Monasteries.*

At Velestino : St. George, situated at an hour's distance from Philippopolis, confiscated.

At Kuklena : SS. Anargyroi, also at an hour's distance from Philippopolis, confiscated.

At Vodena : St. Keryx, two hours from Philippopolis, confiscated.

Persecution of the Greek Language and Literature.

In accordance with Art. 347 of the Organic Statute, the expenses of the establishment and maintenance of primary and secondary schools are at the charge of the religious communities.

According to Art. 348, if any community lacks the

necessary means for the establishment and maintenance of its schools, the State is to grant a subsidy for the purpose. But although the Bulgarian Government imposes heavy taxes, especially set apart for the expenses of public instruction, to which the Greeks regularly contribute, and although Art. 25 requires a proportionate distribution of these taxes, no Greek school has ever received a subsidy.

On the other hand, the Bulgarian Government grants large and regular subsidies to Turkish and Bulgarian schools.

The Bulgarians, however, are not content with undermining Greek education indirectly by the refusal of subsidies, but they go further, and, in spite of the clause of Art. 38 which assures liberty of education, the Chamber, with Stambouloff as Premier, voted in 1891 a law by which Greek boys and girls were compelled to attend the Bulgarian schools from the age of six to that of twelve years. Art. 8 of this law states that "all children, from the age of six until twelve years inclusive must follow the lessons of public instruction either in the national or private schools, or at home." Art. 10 says, "Children of Bulgarian subjects of all Christian creeds must receive the primary education in the Bulgarian language."

The Greek children could only attend their own schools after this enforced attendance at the Bulgarian schools, and this amounted to a direct suppression of Greek education.

It must be confessed that this law, although it has been passed, has not yet been put into force (in spite of the threats of successive Governments), but remains suspended, a Damoclean sword, over the heads of the Greeks.

The Government of the principality, afraid openly to violate so express an article of the Constitution, has attempted to distort it, and offers subsidies to the Greeks on condition of their accepting the new educational law, which they have hitherto refused; on the other hand, in October 1904 it sent a circular, through

the inspector of the Bulgarian schools of Pyrgos, imposing on the Greek schools the teaching of the Bulgarian language for thirty-four hours per week, thus rendering instruction in Greek impossible. In addition to this, the Government proceeded to inflict heavy fines on the Greek peasants of many villages round Pyrgos who refused to comply with this measure.

As if this were not sufficient, notwithstanding the inviolability of property as assured in Articles 34, 35, and 36 of the Constitution, the Bulgarians have forcibly seized the Greek schools of Chaskovo and Dermenderé, after assaulting and expelling the teachers.

We have quoted above Art. 22 of the Constitution, which assures the equality of the Greek, Bulgarian, and Turkish languages. This has been violated: (1) by the imposition of heavy taxes on Greek signs placed on shops, and (2) by the prohibition of Greek newspapers.

Again, after the custom of conquerors, the Government has systematically changed the Greek names of many towns; *e.g.*, Philippopolis and Stenimachos have been given the names of Plovdiv and Asenofgrad.

Such is the manner in which the Bulgarians have respected the equality of languages so carefully safeguarded by the Constitution.

The following is a list of schools, educational institutions, and other properties of the Greek communities which have been forcibly seized, robbed, or confiscated by the Bulgarians from July 15 till to-day.

I. *Schools.*

At Philippopolis, "Marasli" School, which was looted and transformed into a Bulgarian school. The girls' school, after having been looted, was given up to the Greeks. The same fate befell the municipal girls' school, the school of St. Marina, that of St. Constantine, the boarding-schools both for boys and girls.

At Stenimachos, the High School of the Archangels confiscated, as well as the girls' school. The municipal school of Tsiprochori was entirely destroyed, and can-

not now be rebuilt, owing to the new plan of the town.

At Tatar-Bazartzik, the boys school and the girls' school, both confiscated.

At Peristera, the municipal school.

At Kuklena, the municipal school.

II. *Town and Country Property of the Communities.*

At Philippopolis. The following shops : a shoemaker's, giving an annual revenue of 144 fr. ; a joiner's, giving 214 fr. ; a milkshop, giving 192 fr. ; a cabinet-maker's, giving 300 fr. ; a pastry-cook's, giving 600 fr. ; another milkshop, giving 480 fr. ; a coffee-house, 500 fr. ; a barber's, 18 fr. ; another shoemaker's, giving 240 fr. All these buildings were the property of the church of St. Demetrios.

A fruiterer's shop, giving 240 fr. per year, the property of the church of St. Constantine ; a jeweller's shop, giving 240 fr., the property of St. Marina's ; a draper's shop, 300 fr., the property of Mr. Ghioumusjordani ; a grocer's shop, 75 fr., property of St. Marina's ; a shoemaker's, 42 fr., and another shop 144 fr., belonging to the church of St. Constantine ; three rooms belonging to Mr. Ghioumusjordani, 150 fr. ; a house belonging to St. Constantine's Church, 240 fr., and five other houses of the same church, 144 fr. each ; also thirteen shops of the same church, 1113 fr. ; a baker's shop belonging to the church of St. Paraskevi, 500 fr. ; a stable of the same church, 100 fr., and five rooms, 156 fr. ; two houses, the property of the same church ; a hotel, bringing 1000 fr. annually, the property of Mr. Ghioumusjordani, and a house of St. Constantine's Church, 120 fr.

At Stenimachos, a vineyard one hectare in extent, property of the church of the Holy Trinity ; a small chapel with lands, belonging to the church of St. Nicholas.

III

BULGARIAN OUTRAGES ON GREEKS

WITH the advance of time the instincts of the Bulgarian mob became more dangerous, and to this result public education has conduced more than anything else. As we have repeatedly complained, the Bulgarian boy is daily taught in his school to hate the Greek. His national song ends with the words, "Slaughter the Greeks." No occasion is lost on days of national festivity for manifesting this hatred against every Greek in the country.

Things continued in this state until last May, when the Bulgarians, instructed by their teachers, were eagerly awaiting the opportune moment to carry out their nefarious programme—to wit, the extermination of the Greek population.

The opportunity came at last. The Greek Macedonian bands had for two years been engaged in a defensive struggle for their country. The Bulgarian bands which had been devastating Macedonia were retiring upon the principality, and Bulgarian prestige was daily dwindling.

Some interest was aroused in Europe with regard to Greek energy and Greek rights in Macedonia.

Meetings were convoked in Bulgaria, at which the more fanatical called for the massacre and extermination of the Greeks.

At Philippopolis, on July 16, the following resolution was passed at a meeting:

"1. That the Bulgarian Government be called upon to apply the law of 1892, according to which the primary

education of the pupils of all nationalities must take place in the Bulgarian language.

“2. That a strict supervision of the work of the Greek schools be exercised.

“3. That all Greek doctors, judges, engineers, military and other officials be dismissed from the public service.

“4. That the indignation of the meeting be expressed against the Greek nation for its action in Macedonia.

“5. That an expression of gratitude be addressed to the Bulgarian citizens of Varna for their patriotic action with regard to the Greeks ; and

“6. That the occupation of the Greek church of St. Charalambos be confirmed, and the church be re-dedicated to St. Elias.”

And at Iampolis, at the demonstration of July 27 (O.S.), the following resolution was adopted by the assembled crowd :

“To-day, the 27th of July, twenty thousand inhabitants of Iampolis assembled in the square in order to deliberate concerning the ferocious and inhuman campaign of the Greeks, which aims at destroying everything Bulgarian, and which they carry on in a shameless manner within the boundaries of our sacred Bulgarian country.

“At the same time, we have assembled in order to point out to those in whose hands the interests of the Bulgarian nation are entrusted the means which they ought to employ in order to prevent this mischief and root out the evil ; and after hearing our fellow-citizens Jordan Miteff, Vassil Vlachoff, Athanas Tsirbantzieff, and Giorgi Arabatzieff, we unanimously resolve :

“(1) That the Bulgarian Government should break off diplomatic relations with the Greek Government until the latter cease sending out malefactors in order to exterminate the Bulgarian race in Turkey.

“(2) That the Bulgarian Government should immediately dismiss all civil officers, as well as those employed by the communities, and military officers who marry Greek women or send their children to Greek schools.

“(3) That a campaign be commenced against everything Greek; that all Greek clergy and teachers be expelled from Bulgarian territory, as sowing discord and slander against everything Bulgarian.

“(4) That all Greeks who are suspected of supporting the brigand-like action of the Greek bands in Turkey be expelled from Bulgaria.

“(5) That all Hellenic subjects and Greek subjects of foreign Powers be forbidden by law from carrying on business outside the towns.

“(6) That doctors, lawyers, and other professional men, graduates of Greek schools, be forbidden by law to exercise their profession in Bulgaria.

“(7) That all Greek schools be closed, and that the children of Greeks living in Bulgaria be instructed in Bulgarian schools, under pain of expulsion from Bulgarian territory.

“(8) That no Greeks be permitted to become naturalised Bulgarian subjects.

“(9) That all the institutions and schools belonging to Greek communities in Bulgaria be confiscated, and their revenues be devoted to national objects.

“(10) That all goods imported from Greece be liable to the maximum duty, and that heavy taxes be imposed on Greeks carrying on business in Bulgaria, and that Greek ships entering Bulgarian ports be subjected to heavy dues.

“(11) We address our warm sympathy to the champions at Varna, Pyrgos, Philippopolis, Stenimachos, Peristera, and elsewhere for their splendid self-sacrifice in the patriotic struggle against Greek machinations.

“(12) We earnestly beg the Bulgarian Government to take into consideration the will of the people as expressed at these demonstrations, and to use all its efforts in support of the national interests, trusting in the national power of self-sacrifice, and

“(13) To close the Bulgarian frontiers to all Greeks expelled from Rumania.”

At Philippopolis a demonstration took place on the

6/19 August, at which the following resolution was adopted :

“To-day, August 19, 1906, the representatives of the Bulgarian people assembled at Philippopolis at a grand national demonstration resolve :

“(1) That the policy followed by Greece, the Œcumenical Patriarch, and by Turkey tends to the destruction of the Bulgarian race in Turkey.

“(2) That the patience and peacefulness hitherto shown by the Bulgarian people and their Government, however necessary they may be for the regular development of any nation, and especially for the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula, become positively criminal in face of the above-mentioned policy, since that peace which is so desirable in the Balkan Peninsula is not attainable by these means.

“(3) That European diplomacy has not only failed in checking this barbarous policy, but by means of the Mürsztegian reforms and otherwise has rendered the position of the Bulgarians in European Turkey worse, by raising false hopes which have induced them to lay down their arms and desist from defending themselves.

“(4) That the policy of Greece, who sends bands of assassins into Macedonia, is not only tolerated by Turkey, but actively supported.

“(5) That in consequence of all this the Bulgarian people and Government must necessarily abandon the policy of peace which compels them to look on with folded arms while civilised Europe in its cold-hearted diplomacy tolerates the annihilation of an unarmed race, a race guilty only of wishing to be Bulgarian and of not wishing to become a bridge leading to the Mediterranean.

“Under these circumstances we here assembled do unanimously call upon the Government :

“(a) To enter into the contest actively and energetically, and by every means to obtain the application of the 23rd Article of the Berlin Treaty.

“(b) To break off diplomatic relations with Greece, in order that it may be able to use every measure of

retaliation against Greek subjects which is permitted by international law—*i.e.*, expulsion, boycotting of Greek merchandise, &c.

“We certify that :

“(a) The reforms of Mürszteg—even if applied in their entirety and conscientiously—have no other effect but that of facilitating the annihilation of the Bulgarian people.

“(b) That the Bulgarian people has exhibited the utmost toleration towards all nationalities in Bulgaria; and we regret that the Greeks, by their inhuman policy and their continual provocation, have compelled certain individuals among our people to depart from their spirit of toleration.

“We call upon the people of Bulgaria actively and courageously to support their oppressed brethren who are struggling for their lives and liberties, and not to cease their activity until the 23rd Article of the Berlin Treaty shall have been put into force.”

At a similar meeting at Sofia, on July 23, 1906 (O.S.), the Bulgarian Government was called upon :

“I. To break off official relations with Greece and to recall the Bulgarian Agent at Athens, because the Government of Athens sends armed bands into Macedonia.

“II. To confiscate all Greek churches in Bulgaria, because they were built with money made in Bulgaria.

“III. To take coercive measures against the Greeks of the principality similar to those adopted by the Roumanians, so as to compel them to leave the country.”

The national club, “The Bulgarian Patriots,” issued the following manifesto to the Bulgarians of the principality :

“BRETHREN,—The anti-Greek movement, as a reaction against the national inertness, has turned the whole country upside down, and has put an end to our unjusti-

fiable and criminal patience in the face of the outrages of our eternal enemies the Greeks.

“Those who love their country have at this critical moment a sacred duty, to hold out a friendly hand with a view to brotherly action in the struggle which is still in its commencement, and which needs continuous and inexhaustible activity and universal support, that it may be crowned with success and victory over the accursed enemy.

“After the blow administered by the seizure of Greek schools and churches (our rightful property, inherited from our grandparents and forefathers), in order that the loathed Greek might feel that he is living in Bulgaria, and must obey the laws and respect the people who afford him hospitality, the committee of the national club, the ‘Bulgarian Patriot,’ now hereby proclaims, and invites you also to proclaim, a boycott against everything Greek.

“1. Do not call a Greek physician to the bedside of your sick, and do not use medicines from a Greek chemist.

“2. Do not apply to a Greek lawyer to plead your cause.

“3. Avoid Greek commission agents, representatives of firms and companies, &c.

“4. Do not buy anything from Greek merchants or artisans.

“5. Do not deal with Greek wholesale merchants.

“6. Do not buy stale fish, rotten olives, mildewed lemons, or anything else sold by Greeks.

“7. Do not buy silkworms’ eggs from a Greek, and do not sell him your golden cocoons.

“8. Do not buy the island wine, the adulterated wine of vinegar and rake, which is prepared by Greeks.

“9. Do not sell attar of roses to a Greek, so that he may not adulterate it and compromise you in the European market.

“10. Do not sell your provisions to Greek merchants who cheat you both in the weight and in the bill.

“11. Do not admit Greek workmen or servants to

your factories, shops, or houses. The only profit you can gain from them is corruption and treachery.

“Bulgarian Patriots!—From this very day abandon all the hotels, wine-shops, and coffee-houses whose proprietors are Greeks.

“Bulgarians!—We must carry on this war declared against the Greeks to the end, in a manner worthy of our forefathers and to the honour of our mother Bulgaria. This struggle will be the sole vengeance for your long-suffering brethren, who are mercilessly murdered by the Greek bands, supported and sustained by gold earned in Bulgaria.

“Bulgarians!—When you meet a Greek remember that you are a descendant of Krumm and Ashen, of Simeon and Samuel! Never forget that you see before you a bastard descendant of Basil the slayer of the Bulgarians.

“Brethren!—Support by all means in your power this boycott of everything Greek, and vigorously continue the struggle against the effeminate and degenerate Phanariots. In this way only can we show that we too are possessed of national pride and honour.”

(Issued by the Presidency of the National Club of Philippopolis, the “Bulgarian Patriot.”)

The following appeals were placarded in all parts of the town of Philippopolis :

“It is strictly forbidden to speak the Phanariot (Greek) language in the gardens, in restaurants, in coffee-houses, or in the street.

“BY ORDER OF THE PEOPLE.”

“Turks, Armenians, Jews, and the rest!—Support the boycott of the Greeks, and see that it is carried out. Conform to the order of the people. Those who do not obey will be mercilessly punished and persecuted.”

“ORDER OF THE PEOPLE, No. 4.—Decision of the Rodolinbets Committee : Proclamation to the Bulgarian brethren.

“After punishing them by seizing their churches and schools, it is our duty to boycott everything Greek.”

This is followed by eleven articles, in which all relations with Greeks are forbidden. The appeal concludes with the words :

“Patriots of Bulgaria!—Remember that you, the descendants of the Czar Krumm, have before you the descendants of Basil the slayer of Bulgarians.”

The programme of the “Bulgarian Patriot,” as published in the Bulgarian newspaper *Devnik*, the leader of anti-Greek movement in Bulgaria, is as follows :

“1. The complete Bulgarisation of the whole seaboard. The two centres of Hellenism, Anchialos and Mesemvria, to be re-named ‘Simeonofgrad’ and ‘Caloyannofgrad.’ Emigrants from the interior to be settled in these towns. In order to force the Greeks to emigrate, the fisheries of Sozopolis and the salt-works of Anchialos to be ‘confiscated and handed over to Bulgarians.’ Measures to be taken for the Bulgarisation of the Gagaouses [Greeks using the Turkish language and inhabiting the sea coast to the north of Varna].

“2. Similar measures to be enforced against the Greeks of the interior. Cavakli to be re-named ‘Samuelofgrad.’

“The Greeks to be everywhere forced by Draconian laws to become naturalised Bulgarian subjects.

“3. The Greek minority to study the Bulgarian language, so that they may not differ from the Bulgarians.

“4. The Greek bishops to be prohibited ‘from returning to Bulgaria.’”

Similar ideas were expressed by M. Dragouleff at the meeting on September 6 (O.S.), and were included in the resolution adopted.

The Bulgarian Government at first attempted to curb the fanaticism of the orators at these meetings. M. Petkoff, the Minister of the Interior, himself condemned in the Sobranje the inhuman conduct of the Rumanian

Government towards the Greek population of that kingdom, and expressed himself as follows :

“ We can assure you that our relations with Greece are good, and the gentleman whom we have appointed as our diplomatic agent at Athens, M. Balabanoff, is a graduate of Athens University, and serves to show our desire to remain on good terms with Greece.

“ We do not desire to be, neither do we think of being, on bad terms with Greece on account of anything which may be happening in Macedonia, which for the present is a Turkish province. . . .

“ At Philippopolis and Stenimachos there have been disturbances, due to Chauvinism and party reasons, and in some degree to Macedonian patriotism ; there has been a wish to loot a certain coffee-house ; but I have given orders to the military governor to restore order, and to guard the churches against any emergency. . . . How can the Government permit the local Greeks to be persecuted because other Greeks in Macedonia are molesting our fellow-countrymen ? Such action would be scandalous.

“ Our agent went one day, in conjunction with the other foreign envoys, and made representations to the Greek Minister to the effect that Greece was permitting insurgent bands to cross over into Macedonia, and that many of these Greek insurgents had returned from Macedonia, and were to be seen walking the streets of Athens, &c. The Greek Minister replied that there were really insurgents at Athens, but that there were some also at Sofia. ‘ Your Government,’ said the Greek Minister, ‘ why does it not imprison Sarafoff ? ’ The reply was just. Therefore, as our position with regard to Macedonia is delicate, so is theirs at Athens. That the Greeks cross over the frontier in order to fight the Bulgarians is undoubtedly true, but it cannot be denied that our side do the same.

“ It must not be inferred, however, from this that our relations with Greece have reached a disagreeable stage. Officially, as states, we are on very good terms, and there is nothing to cloud our good relations. . . .

"I cannot comprehend why, because Greeks in Macedonia are acting in an iniquitous manner, we should persecute law-abiding Greek citizens in Bulgaria, and entangle ourselves in war. I have already said that, as the Greek Premier was able to answer our representative when he spoke to him with regard to the formation of Greek bands in Macedonia, our Premier can make a similar reply when the Greek representative visits him here in order to protest against similar acts. . . ."

But in spite of such reasonable counsels the ferocious instincts of the Bulgarian mob finally prevailed. The first outbreak took place at Varna.

After the death of the late Greek Bishop another was elected, and sent, according to the treaties, by the Œcumenical Patriarch to that see. The Bulgarian mob was infuriated; the arrival of the Bishop at the port of Varna is described in the following document:

"VARNA, *July 4, 1906.*

"Yesterday we were expecting our new Bishop Neophytos. We had arranged for his reception, and had seen to it that it should take place without any fuss or display, for reasons which can well be understood.

"At 6 A.M. the Austrian steamer was entering the harbour, when we received the news that the police had orders to prevent the landing of the Bishop. Two of the leading residents immediately hastened to the Prefect, whom they found at seven o'clock in his office. He received them courteously, but referred them to the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and of Religion. They telegraphed immediately, but at 4 P.M., ten hours later, during which time the steamer remained in the harbour, no answer had arrived from Sofia.

"It is obvious, therefore, that the landing of the Bishop was prevented by order of the Bulgarian Government. In the meantime, the Turkish Consul, a sincerely polite man, named Ishan Bey, and the Greek Consul, M. Seleniades, were informed of the difficulty. But meanwhile a public crier was summoning the people with a drum to descend to the quay in front of the Austrian

steamer to protest against the arrival of the Greek Bishop, whose hands, they shouted, were stained with Bulgarian blood! And various agitators, drawn from all classes of Bulgarian society, were inciting the mob to tear him to pieces if the Government should permit him to land.

"In addition to this, the fire brigade was ordered to execute evolutions round the ships and buildings near the harbour.

"The people, seeing the fire-engines and firemen hurrying down to the quay, followed after to see what was the matter, such of them at least as had not already learnt about the demonstration. A large crowd was thus collected on the quay, consisting of milkmen, green-grocers, coal-heavers, porters, merchants, artisans, and even lawyers and doctors (many of whom were Bulgarians from Macedonia), and soon began to defy the few Greeks who were present. One Bulgarian attacked the seventy-five year old priest Eustathios, and twice pushed him violently. The police prevented the Greeks from boarding the steamer, whence the Bishop gazed in grief and astonishment at the furious mob, who were shouting out the vilest abuse of the Greeks in general and their Bishop in particular. The Greeks among the crowd being few in number, gradually give way in order to avoid a conflict. Then the Turkish Consul, pushing aside the police, went on board the steamer and attempted to comfort the Bishop with hopes of his being allowed to land. He subsequently called on the Prefect, but in vain, as the latter avowed that he had not yet received orders from Sofia to permit the landing of the Bishop.

"The steamer left at 4 P.M. for Soulina, taking with it our unfortunate Bishop, who returned to Constantinople."

The Bulgarian agent there expressed his regret to the Ecumenical Patriarch, and promised that he would do his best to persuade his Government to permit the Bishop's return. The Patriarchate unfortunately put faith in the assurances of the Bulgarian agent, and the

Metropolitan returned. But his second reception was worse than the first. An eye-witness narrates what took place in these words :

“ VARNÁ, July 8, 1906.

“ Yesterday about 4 P.M. it was announced by drum-beating in the streets of the town that, according to a telegram from Burgas (Pyrgos), the Greek Bishop was arriving by the steamer *Mykale* that evening.

“ All the faithful thereupon ran towards the quay, armed with sticks, bars of iron, stones, and whips, in order to discharge their national duty. Within an hour about 500 had assembled to await the arrival of the steamer. The special police measures of June 24 were not taken this time, because both parties were equally aware that the Greek Bishop was not arriving this time. The crowd came together with a different object. About six o'clock in the evening the Prefect of Varna, M. Charalambieff, arrived in his carriage and requested the people to go home, as it was known that the steamer *Mykale* would not arrive that evening, but the next.

“ At about 6.30 they appeared to be convinced, and started off *en masse*. They took the Tsarigratska Road, and were directing themselves towards Preslavaska Street when the Prefect in his carriage instructed them, through the attendant gendarme, to follow the next street. At the same time other small bands of Bulgarians, coming from the Mousala Square, followed the Tsar Boris Street, which led to their goal. Simultaneously another crowd, coming from the opposite direction, also made for the same point, and when they reached the second police station were met by four mounted gendarmes, who accompanied them to keep order! This last contingent was the first to reach the Greek Church of St. Nicholas, which the priests were just leaving after evensong. The crowd thereupon burst into the churchyard with shouts and pistol shots, and attacked the three priests, the chanter, and the sexton. At that moment the crowd from the quay arrived, with that from the Mousala Square, and they also rushed with savage cries into the churchyard. Then

with sticks and cudgels, iron bars and leathern thongs, with fists and feet, they fell upon all in the church and beat and wounded them most unmercifully.

"The clerk was carried out of the church more dead than alive. The sexton ran up the tower to sound the alarm bell, but he was seized and thrown from the belfry on to the roof of the church, where he remained unconscious until others climbed on the roof, dragged him down, beat him and kicked him, and finally threw him into the road fainting and covered with blood. Those who remained in the belfry began to ring the church bells. Others rang the bells of the neighbouring Bulgarian church. Many people, thinking that a fire had broken out, came running up to the church but could not approach owing to the crowd. The police at once hastened to reinforce the gendarmes near the church and to see where the fire was. The fire brigade arrived, and the police officials with the chief of police. On learning, however, that there was no fire, the fire brigade went off, while the police remained apathetic spectators of the horrible scene.

"Then a priest appeared, covered with blood, running from the church and stumbling as if blind. He was hardly recognisable. This was the priest, John Karavatakis, who had suffered a real martyrdom in a Christian church and at the hands of Christians. He had been seized by the beard, kicked and struck with sticks, whips, stones, and iron bars; others caught him by the hair and threw him to the ground. His head and body were a mass of wounds; his hair was torn out by the roots; his clothes ripped to rags, and he would have been killed had not an officer who was looking on received a blow intended for the priest, which caused him to draw his sword and temporarily break up that group of assailants. The priest seized the opportunity to escape, streaming with blood, a shocking sight to see.

"The crowd destroyed all the sacred books of the church, tore down the name of St. Nicholas from the building, and set up in its stead a wooden placard with the dedication to Saints Cyril and Methodios."

These outrages at Varna were the prelude to the bloody campaign of extermination which was afterwards prosecuted throughout the principality. I publish here a detailed account of these crimes; it is merely a historical document, and not a sensational manifesto intended to excite sympathy on behalf of the Greek populations of Bulgaria, forced as they are to wander east and west in order to find an asylum, while civilised Europe excuses and even congratulates the perpetrators.

The following list is compiled from trustworthy official sources :

I. *At Philippopolis.*

July 15—August 14, 1906.

July 15.—Proclamations placarded in the town call the people to a meeting to-morrow in order to “express their deep antipathy to the Greeks and their approval and congratulations to the people of Varna for their work of the highest patriotism.”

July 16.—A Bulgarian mob this morning seized the Church of St. Charalambos; the sacred books were burnt; a Bulgarian priest established in the church and a service at once held. At 10 A.M. a demonstration of 2000 or 3000 people took place, many of the people coming in from the country. After the demonstration the mob stormed the residence of the Archbishop, the interior of which was pillaged and completely destroyed, as well as the Church of St. Marina, which was looted. The churches of St. Constantine, St. Demetrios, St. Paraskevi, and St. Dionysios were also occupied and looted by the mob. The Marasli school for boys, the girls' school, and the primary school for girls (on the premises of which are the soup-kitchen for poor scholars and the musical club, the “Orpheus”), the infants' schools of St. Marina and of St. Constantine, and the girls' and boys' boarding-schools were entirely looted. Even the furniture and clothes of the school servants were stolen or destroyed. The Greek club, the offices of the society of Greek subjects, the “Concord,” and forty-eight Greek shops were also demolished.

A mob of ruffians under the command of the chief comitadji, Arnaoutoff, and a certain municipal official, rushed into the residence of the Archbishop, burst into his study, killed the messenger, Nicholas Mavroudi, and brutally assaulted the *locum tenens* of the Archbishop, whom they robbed and beat and chloroformed: they finally tried to throw him out of the window, but his friends with great difficulty managed to convey him to the hospital Sœurs d'Agram, where he remains. The mob broke down the doors of the house of the aged lawyer Maliadis, and rushed into it. Maliadis shot the first man who entered, and was then slaughtered before the eyes of four policemen.

Of the above churches, the Committee offered to return those of St. Demetrios and St. Constantine to the Greeks, who refused to accept them. That of St. Dionysios, which belongs to Greek subjects, was given back to them.

July 17.—Measures were taken to extort from the Greeks large sums of money, and to coerce them into signing a declaration of "adhesion to the Exarchate."

In the confiscated Greek churches of Philippopolis managing boards were established, which took possession of the landed property of the Greek community or churches, consisting of shops, houses, stores, &c., leased to fifty-two tenants for a yearly rental of 8220 fr. in all. These Bulgarian administrators compelled the tenants to make new lease contracts with them.

July 20.—A demonstration at Tatar Bazartzik. The Church of the Transfiguration was confiscated by the Bulgarians, who gave it the name of SS. Cyril and Methodios. The boys' and girls' schools were also confiscated. These schools are furnished with a marble plaque, on which is inscribed, "This school was founded at the expense of the Philhellene Lord J. Long and the Greek community of Tatar Bazartzik in 1877."

A demonstration was held at Peristera. The Church of the Virgin and the primary school were confiscated: the latter was also looted.

The monasteries of St. Anargyroi, near Kuklæna, and

of St. George, near Velastitsa, were confiscated. These two monasteries, together with that at Bodena, own several acres of fields and vineyards, also woods and cattle.

At Philippopolis (our informant was the Prefect himself) the representative of the Bulgarian Metropolitan demanded from the Public Prosecutor the very valuable Gospel of the Greek Cathedral,* which had been confiscated, together with the objects saved from the loot of the Greek Archbishop's residence, which included his library. The Public Prosecutor and the commander of the garrison, General Ivanoff—the latter after receiving instructions from the Ministry of War—gave orders that these objects should be handed over to the representative of the Bulgarian Metropolitan. The Archbishop's residence, which was guarded by an armed force, was also delivered up to the Bulgarian ecclesiastical authorities.

July 22.—The Prefect of Philippopolis went to Stenimachos and summoned the Greek doctor Doxiades to visit him in the night. He then advised him to use his influence in order that the Church of the Holy Trinity might be voluntarily handed over to the Committee, so as to avoid possible disturbances. The Prefect also succeeded in obtaining from the deacon the keys of the church, and set over it a guard of ten soldiers.

July, 1906.—At the Church of St. George at Philippopolis the Bulgarian flag was hoisted, and the sacred books and vessels destroyed. It is authentically recorded that the doors of this church, as well as those of the high school, were broken open by Bulgarian officers and soldiers. It is, moreover, incontestable that the police, the guard of artillery, and the Bulgarian cavalry sent to put down the riots all took part on some occasions in the destruction of churches and property. And indeed, wherever the authorities did not actively take part, they silently encouraged the mob by the very fact of their unprotesting presence.

* During the attack on the churches the mob scratched out the eyes of all the holy eikons in the Cathedral, overturned the holy table, and broke to pieces the sacred vessels.

On the day following the demonstration, the Bulgarian officer Toteff, who had been told off to guard the central girls' school and the school of the Archangels, handed over both schools to the committee which had organised the anti-Greek movement.

The civil authorities do not attempt to conceal the conduct of the army, hoping perhaps that they will thus be able to justify their own incapacity. One of the higher officials on his return from Stenimachos stated that the officers with General Ivanoff, commanding the troops at that town, were supporters of the Opposition and hoped to injure the Government. Thus, although they were authorised by the Government to fire on the crowd, they contented themselves with ordering the troops to fire once in the air.

It now appears certain that the whole of the damage at that place was done by three small bands of fifty men; and the higher official already quoted, when it was suggested that twenty policemen would be sufficient to keep order, merely replied that the demonstrators indeed were only 150, but there were also at least 200 soldiers who took part in the disturbances.

The troops aided the Bulgarians, who destroyed from its foundations the primary school of Tsiprochori, occupied the Church of the Holy Trinity, together with the infants' school attached thereto, and subsequently entered the Greek girls' school and vented their spite on the windows, papers, books, and furniture. The cavalry, not wishing to forego their share of cowardly amusement, charged the unarmed Greeks with their sabres, and scattered them up and down the streets. They afterwards, together with the infantry, formed a square with the comitadjis in the centre and proceeded to loot and destroy the shops and coffee-houses.

The troops again intervened to enable the mob to occupy the Church of St. George, which the Greeks were attempting to defend. The school and library were next looted and set on fire, as were all the other schools in turn, seven in number, and the remaining churches, in number eight.

After this the mob proceeded to the destruction of shops and houses, causing damage to the extent of over 1,000,000 fr.

I repeat here that these disturbances were prearranged by the official and revolutionary circles of Sofia. It was the programme of Sarafoff, which was proclaimed throughout all Europe, but left Europe unmoved and unprotesting. It was the programme of the destruction by fire and sword of the whole Greek population living in the vicinity of Bulgarians, and was thus formulated by the *Evening Post*, the official revolutionary organ of the Bulgarian capital, in December 1904 :

“ One race alone must dominate in the Balkans—the Bulgarian. To that end Hellenism must be extirpated in both Macedonia and Eastern Rumelia. . . . The destruction of Hellenism must become an article of faith for the Bulgarians. . . . The struggle against Hellenism must commence in its very cradle. . . . Bulgarians, do not forget your duty ! ”

All the revolutionary committees were animated with these ideas, and proclaimed a holy war against the Greeks of the principality and of Macedonia, and in fact against everything that is Greek. To the foreigners resident in Bulgaria who follow the trend of affairs these things are not unknown. As I have already said, an investigation carried out by impartial men who sympathise with neither nationality would suffice to justify all Hellenic contentions. In spite of Prince Ferdinand's public defence of the Bulgarian crimes, honourable and sincere Bulgarians have not been wanting to denounce them both in the *Sobranje* and in the Press. I here insert a speech delivered in the *Sobranje* by M. Passareff, one of the deputies, as well as some articles from the Bulgarian Press.

“ Has the Government,” demanded M. Passareff, “ done anything to prevent the invasion of Macedonia by Greek bands and to defend our fellow nationalists there ? What has it done ? I see nothing. Some are for reprisals against Greece. It may be that such reprisals are con-

sidered untimely, as injuring other Bulgarian interests. But in this case were the reprisals against Bulgarian subjects of Greek nationality more excusable? I can understand the Government not preventing the demonstrations, but to allow the vandalism which has taken place I consider a crime on the part of the Minister, who is guilty of abetting the scandal. Let me give you a few examples from Varna. When the landing of the Greek Bishop Neophytos was prevented, certain individuals took a donkey, dressed it in sacerdotal garments, and drove it through the streets. And who do you think were in this procession? Among the crowd were a number of gendarmes with one of their officers, and the whole procession was led by the Chief of Police! The Prefect asked three days in succession for instructions from the Ministry, but received no answer.

"We are also aware that the Prefects of Philippopolis and Pyrgos (Bourgas) left these towns for the country, so that they might be absent at the time of the disturbances. Such arbitrary action on the part of the mob would be impossible in any other country, as it would be impossible in Bulgaria without the support of the police, and because of this action the prestige which Bulgaria has gained during thirty years was lost in as many days.

"How is it that the riots and the plunder of Greek property has not recurred since the return of the Minister Pettkoff from his journey, and since he began to take severe measures against them? Answer me that question! Is it not because during the first days of the riots the authorities protected and encouraged the rioters, whereas it has subsequently been compelled to pronounce against them?"

VOICES (from the supporters of the Government):
"The Opposition led the mob—it was they who committed the vandalism."

PASSAREFF: "That does not justify you. The authorities ought not to have allowed attacks on foreign property, and it is untrue that the Opposition fomented the dis-

turbances. What had it to gain from such outrages? What advantage has accrued from them? That we have got a few churches? I repeat that these occurrences have discredited Bulgaria and disgraced Government, for the Government at any rate failed to prevent what it may not have actually instigated."

The words of the Bulgarian deputy, who spoke with so much courage and sincerity, need no comment from us. We can only recommend them to the public opinion of Europe.

The *New Century*, one of the leading journals of Bulgaria, writes as follows :

"The attention of public opinion has been drawn to the details, now arriving, of the regrettable events at Anchialos. Very nearly the whole town has been destroyed by fire, as the result of a patriotic manifestation. It is mournful to think that the whole of this evil has been committed in the name of an agitation which is intended to promote the liberty of man, the immunity of the person, and the assurance of a civilised life.

"The anti-Greek movement in this country, which has been manifested with such vehemence and force, is not due to a fanatical Chauvinism which only aims at devastation. The highest ideals are comprehended in the movement, which give to it strength and increase its activity. But if this is the case it must not be stained with such crimes as these. This movement must remain to the end such as it was in its commencement—ideal in its object and unassailable in its purity. But certain passionate elements in the country have stained its reputation, and at Anchialos have totally obscured its significance. The world recognised at first the high character of the sentiments which were manifested at Varna, and people outside Bulgaria would have been ready to approve the movement, notwithstanding even all the violations of the law at Philippopolis, had not the destruction of Anchialos followed.

"Investigation has not yet discovered those who are responsible for this fearful crime, but whatever be

the result, the latter will remain an essential feature of the event. The outer world will derive its impression from first appearances, and these will only hinder our cause and discredit the whole nation, as well as the men who must have foreseen the affair but had not the prudence to prevent it."

The outrageous conduct of the Bulgarians is amply proved by the fact that even this journal, which goes on to attack the Greeks in no measured terms, can yet express nothing but disgust for the action of their opponents. The article concludes that it is difficult to refute the argument of a Viennese newspaper which declares that Bulgarians are now the perpetrators and not the victims of Bulgarian atrocities.

The *Bulgaria*, another paper, writes :

"The Government with a light conscience has permitted the complete destruction of an entire Bulgarian town. We are ashamed, and blush to be Bulgarians. Whatever the circumstances may be, this event will stain the name and history of Bulgaria. The present Government is alone responsible for the sad fate of Anchialos, for by a fatal resolution of this Government this little town was chosen as one of the spots where the pre-arranged tragedy of desolation was to be played.

"The plan was put into effect in a way surpassing the expectations of the heroic instigators of the drama, who were not at Anchialos, but the majority of them at Sofia, or rather beyond the frontiers, and who to-day are all here, for they are no others than our governors—Varna, Philippopolis, Pyrgos, Stenimachos, Sofia, Rutschuk, Anchialos, Sozopolis, &c. : these are the points doomed to outrage and desolation. The heroes of the present Government, who arrived on the stage with the conflagration of Macedonia (the movement of 1903), will make their exit in the midst of flames, anarchy, and destruction."

The same journal adds that "the 'full liberty to assemble' which General Petkoff recommends in his last circular to the authorities aggravates the responsibility

of the Government. This will encourage the mob to further violence in future."

The inspiration of these articles is very evident: The *Bulgaria* is the organ of the ex-Premier Daneff, who has repeatedly protested against the useless violence and dangerous excesses of his compatriots.

The *Bourgaski Glas* (or *Voice of Pyrgos*) published the following article, which also throws the responsibility for the destruction of Greek property on to the Bulgarian Government:

"Why do the Greeks emigrate? And who are the guilty parties in the matter of the second conflagration at Anchialos?"

"Nobody approved the outrages against the Greeks permitted by the authorities at the time of the anti-Greek demonstrations.

"It is not surprising that bitter words have been cast at Bulgaria for these outrages, even by our friends. We do not speak of the enemies of Bulgaria; they have found matter in the outrages for unjustified indictments of all Bulgarians.

"Even the Government did not formally approve of the outrages, although everybody knew that it permitted them. The telegrams of the Minister Petkoff in relation to this question are well known. But no one believes our Government. For the sake of appearances it was obliged to take measures against the rioters, and on this account it dismissed a few officials, prosecuted the leaders of the mob, removed to a distance the riotous element, and dismissed the responsible officials, as it could not appear as their coadjutors.

"In our opinion, the words and deeds of the Government are contradictory. Where, for instance, is the logic in superseding the Prefect of Bourgas [Pyrgos] by Zelkoff—the same Zelkoff who, when director of the Prefecture of Philippopolis, with a whole division of troops and 150 policemen at his disposal, permitted the unjustifiable attacks on the private property of the Greek residents? According to the logic of the *Nov Vek*, the

Government not only connives at the action of Zelkoff, but rewards him for the outrages which he permitted by promoting him to the Prefecture of Bourgas, the chief Greek centre, where the greatest outrages have happened, and still continue to be committed; and we shall see that events will prove the existence of the collusion which we allege.

"We hoped in vain that, after the destruction of Anchialos, an end would be made of these acts of violence; only the system has been changed, and instead of attacks in bands, individual persecution and assault has commenced. A gang of criminals under the clear protection of the police and the Government is traversing the Greek villages, robbing the inhabitants, and threatening them with fire and sword.

"This system is more dangerous than the first, for it keeps the Greeks in continual fear, and obliges them to emigrate in crowds. This is the true reason of the emigration of the Greeks, and not the application of the 10th Article of the law concerning education. This Article had been enforced before in some villages (*e.g.*, Bania, Ravdos, Yenikieui, Akrania, and others), but the villagers never even thought of emigrating.

"Nor is emigration caused by the oppression of vexatious laws and the imposition of continual fines, as the Greeks say, 'for sake of appearances': the true cause is to be found in the terrorisation and outrage to which the Greeks have been exposed for three months.

"It is superfluous, we think, to prove to our readers that the Greeks do not dare to complain. And, in truth, to whom can they complain? To the police? But the police openly protect their assailants. Against whom shall they complain? Against the police? God forbid! It is clear that the Greeks do not wish to suffer worse things by complaining, and thus they listen to the propaganda of the Greek agents, and emigrate.

"In order that we may not be accused of vain speaking, or of exaggeration, we will describe what is now taking place at Anchialos.

"That town has been delivered over into the hands of

the tools of the police—Ivan Christeff, Lascaroglou, and Matzaroff! As if the other misfortunes of the inhabitants of Anchialos did not suffice, brigands, gaol-birds, and drunkards have been appointed as municipal officials! About ten of their companions lurk in the neighbourhood of the monastery of St. George. Criminals continually threaten the inhabitants with a fresh conflagration, saying that everything ought to be burnt. On the evening of the 13th instant a fire broke out in the stables of the Black Sea Hotel, in Anchialos. Eye-witnesses assure us that the fire was caused by these malefactors, who threw petroleum on to the roof of the stable. It is a fact that on that evening the Governor and his *locum tenens*, the Mayor, and the municipal officials, as well as the firemen, were all absent from Anchialos! The military force also, as on the eve of July 30th, was withdrawn to Bourgas. Thanks to the calm weather and to the activity of the Policemen B. Popoff and G. Kioutsoukoff, and of the civilians S. Ivanoff and G. Lemblebidgi (and to the hose which chanced to be in the hotel), the fire was extinguished after having destroyed two stables and two houses, causing damage to the extent of some 6000 fr.; but the danger would have been great if there had been any wind, and that part of the town which had hitherto escaped would have been destroyed.

“After the fire had been extinguished, the only one who appeared was Lascaroglou; the other officials and the firemen were not to be found. It is not necessary to remark that the fire produced a great panic, and nearly all the houses and shops were evacuated.

“‘They are burning us again!’ the Greeks cried in terror, and they did not dare to help extinguish the fire, because they did not know what to expect. Fortunately the Bulgarians realised that they had to ‘protect themselves against Bulgarians and not against Greeks,’ and saved what they could.

“After this clear case of incendiarism, even Bulgarians commenced to emigrate from Anchialos, and the officials began to send their families elsewhere, from fear of fresh

fires and pillage. Only the mayoralty and its villains and the police were satisfied ! If this happens at Anchialos, under the eyes of the police (who conveniently shut them), every one can understand what goes on in the villages.

"After such things is it surprising that the Greeks emigrate ?

"The existence of these disorders is due to the connivance of the authorities, and in our Prefecture at any rate anarchy is supreme.

"The police attempt to justify this anarchy by invoking patriotism ; and for thus speaking openly and boldly we know that we shall call down upon ourselves the hatred of the mis-named Nationalists and the persecution of the police and other malefactors.

"But . . . what is to be done ? Until now we have held our peace ; but silence is criminal under the circumstances : an end must be put to this anarchy before the Bulgarians themselves fall victims to it."

The Russophile Sofia journal, the *Glas*, severely condemns the Bulgarian Government for arranging the outrages against the Greeks in conjunction with the mob.

"It would be impossible otherwise," adds this paper, "for the mob to have held Philippopolis and the other places the whole day long.

"For the Government these outrages came as a welcome distraction from their unfortunate Macedonian policy."

The *Evening Post*, which is considered as independent, considers that the events must be looked upon as a desperate explosion of disappointed hopes. "The Macedonians," it says, "see with grief that the Greek policy of outrage in Macedonia is going to be rewarded in Crete."

This phrase of the Bulgarian journal should be noted with regard to the statement of the Powers that the union of Crete with Greece would cause disturbances in

the East. The disturbances take place without the union : then the massacre of Greeks in Macedonia is made the excuse for disappointing Greek hopes in Crete : and finally the Greeks who ask for liberty in Crete are accused of causing the massacre of their countrymen in Bulgaria ! This is European logic.

“Let the ‘ pogrom ’ of Philippopolis serve as a symptom which will give Europe cause for reflection,” says the same journal.

Bulgaria, too, has its yellow press. Here, for example, is an article from the *Daily* of Sofia, a paper which, though rejoicing at the devastation of the Greek town, yet cannot conceal between its lines the truth as to the vitality of Hellenism in Anchialos. The article is preceded by the following remarkable declaration : “ We consider it our duty to state that this article is also an echo of the thoughts of a most important political personage in this country. We therefore recommend the attention of readers and of the Government.

“Anchialos has been burnt down,” continues the journal. “That nest of Greeks on the shore of the Black Sea has been reduced to ruins which are still smoking. For fourteen whole centuries that city, situated on Bulgarian territory, has served as an unapproachable fortress of Hellenism, an impregnable and inviolate acropolis of the Greek idea. It constituted a state within a state, as is also Stenimachos, and even Mesemvria and Sozopolis. Greek laws, Greek interests, and a Greek spirit ruled. Owing to our inertness or political negligence, or for other reasons, Anchialos remained an inviolate island of Hellenism in the midst of a Bulgarian sea in the times of Krumm and of Simeon and of Assen, and up to yesterday. Our sea-board on the Black Sea both was and remains to-day a Greek possession.

“In virtue of we know not what privileges, the Greeks have acquired the right to consider themselves in Anchialos as if in Greece itself. The crowned head which they recognise, and before which they kneel, and whose name they pronounce with respect in church and in school, is

not that of the Bulgarian Prince Ferdinand, but that of the Athenian King George.

“The name of Bulgaria has been driven from the schools, and is only pronounced with aversion.

“Now that in the recent fearful events that lair of the Greek idea has been at last destroyed, it is time for us to awake from our long blindness, and be masters in our own house. It is the duty of the Government to win for Bulgaria this corner of Bulgaria, and not to allow it to recoup itself and regain strength, this pernicious centre where the spirit of hatred and envy of everything Bulgarian was developed with impunity. To prohibit the installation of the Greek Archbishop at Anchialos is by no means sufficient. It is the Greek spirit that must not re-establish itself there.

“At Athens not a coffee-house could exist with a Bulgarian sign; let us in Bulgaria so act that there shall be one Greek fortress the less: we are masters in our own house.

“What should be done? The Government can, and from a legal point of view is entitled to, appropriate the soil under the burnt houses of Anchialos, to plan an entirely new city, and to sell the plots by preference to Bulgarians. Let good Bulgarians live there; let Anchialos be regenerated, let it live again, but now as a Bulgarian city, where a Bulgarian spirit, Bulgarian interests, and Bulgarian life may prevail in future.

“If this means be found impracticable, let another be chosen. A little goodwill, a little more patriotism, neither of which are wanting in the present Government, will be enough to blot out, by peaceful means, of course, this Greek ‘city-state’ from our midst. And still more must be blotted out the shameful remembrance of our long blindness and inertia, by changing the name of the city to another. Let it be called the city of Krumm.

“We repeat, Bulgaria must remain Bulgarian. We feel ourselves to be masters even on that seaboard, and in the future let there reign there, not King George, but the Prince of Bulgaria. Shall we not think about this whilst there is time?

The semi-official *New Century* also published the following article :

“The *Ecclesiastic Truth*, a paper published in Constantinople by the Patriarchate, is full of insults and abominable insinuations against H.R.H. the Prince, his Government, and the Bulgarian people, in consequence of the anti-Greek demonstrations in the country.

“The Prince of Bulgaria refused to accept the calumnies aimed at his Government and people. He refused to believe the ridiculous inventions of the Athenian papers, which have been republished by their European contemporaries devoted to the Greek idea. In fine, he gave a fitting reply to the unseemly telegram of the Patriarch, and this is the reason why he is now insulted in the grossest manner by the organ of the Patriarchate.

“The insinuations of the *Ecclesiastic Truth* are evidently the result of an unhealthy weakness, which can reach at nobody, and they are not worth contradiction. These fits of malignant hysterics cannot harm the political significance and the wide toleration which have always marked the action of H.R.H. the Prince towards his subjects without distinction of race or religion, a toleration of which the Greek newspapers always speak in the highest terms as a special favour to their compatriots. To attribute to-day to the Prince feelings which he has never shown towards the Greeks is obviously a sign of bad faith.

“The Greeks can formulate no accusation against the condition of affairs which had been created for them in Bulgaria hitherto. Without being worthy of it, they were the object of kind attentions on the part of the Prince, of the Government, and of the people. Their calumnies on this heading can touch nobody, and cannot conduce to the result which the organ of the Patriarchate has in view. This organ renders a bad service to the cause which it claims to support, and constitutes a by no means flattering testimony to the state of mind of those who inspire this campaign.

“If Greek interests wish to allay the excitement of the

country against the Greeks, it is strange to set about it by pouring oil on the flames. The Greeks in their excessive Chauvinism have accustomed themselves to behave in a haughty manner, and to consider all other nations as a negligible quantity.

“It can be thus understood how they must have been moved by the events which occurred in the principality, and how the arrogant ambition of the Patriarchate was touched thereby.

“But these events are due to the excitement caused by the Greeks themselves in Bulgaria and by the crimes of Greek bands in Macedonia.

“The Government of the principality used every effort to restrain the feelings of animosity against the Greeks. It is perfectly conscious of having performed its duty as regards the maintenance of order and tranquillity in the country, but no one can ignore the difficulties underlying the discharge of this duty in the present circumstances. The Greek Patriarchate should be the first to comprehend the seriousness of these circumstances and to refrain from commencing a campaign of insinuations and calumnies, whose only result is to create artificial reasons for indignation against the Greeks, in addition to our original grievances.

“It is not by means of insults against the Prince, the Government, and the people of Bulgaria that the Patriarchate can hope to reinstate the Greeks of the principality in the favour which they once enjoyed, or to contribute to the restoration of the old order of things.

“These insults and calumnies, added to the exasperation caused by the events which are daily occurring in Macedonia, create fresh excitement and afford an opportunity for the disturbing elements to further their guilty plans, in spite of the efforts of the Government to prevent them.

“Injustice is not a productive capital, and instead of yielding any profit, it merely calls forth animosities. The Holy Greek Church, which ought to be an institution of the highest impartiality, should have understood this, instead of allowing hateful passions and mean instincts to

obscure the character of its holiness. Its vulgar artifices and dark machinations neither hurt nor frighten the principality. They can only injure the tranquillity of the spiritual flock which is under the protection of the Patriarch.

"It is not, however, our province to give prudent advice to the Patriarchate. Turkey, whose support is constantly invoked by the Patriarch in the thankless task of abusing Bulgaria, ought to have required him to abandon this policy before he formulated any request. Turkey, however, did not take this very seriously; on the contrary, that Government always tolerates the attacks on H.R.H. Prince Ferdinand published in the organ of the Patriarchate in the very centre of Constantinople. Such insulting attacks would not be tolerated in free countries where the censor does not exist.

"Turkish censorship, however, is particular enough in the case of perfectly harmless newspapers. This attitude encourages us to think that if the Porte does not entirely share the sentiments of the Patriarchate, it is not quite foreign to them. It affords grounds for believing in a state of mind which is indirectly manifested. Bulgaria will give it her consideration."

The Paris *Temps* in a leading article says: "The anti-Greek disturbances of Anchialos, Varna, Philipopolis, Pyrgos, Tatar-Bazartzik, and elsewhere, the demonstrations held in the most important towns of Bulgaria, and the characteristic resolutions passed at these meetings, have shown the measure of hatred with which the Greek inhabitants are being exterminated and persecuted throughout the principality.

"The Bulgarian Government, by restraining to the best of its power these demonstrations, showed that it disapproved of the kindling of racial hatred as well as of the incitement to civil war. But whatever improvement has been effected during the last few days, its efforts have necessarily been confined to what doctors call the 'cure of the result.' The cure of the cause escapes Bulgarian policy; it is bound up with those international difficulties which have for so long delayed the treatment of that

illness from which all the Christian peoples of the Levant are suffering.

“The chief theatre of Greco-Bulgarian hatred is in Macedonia. Eastern Rumelia and Danubian Bulgaria above Rhodope and Haemus know but a weak echo of this distant strife. The reprisals which they make use of are only likely to provoke fresh acts of vengeance on the part of the Greeks on Turkish soil, and to perpetuate the wretched state of affairs in Macedonia.

“The Greeks enjoy the privilege of holding, from time immemorial, important positions in the ecclesiastical field. Considering the Bulgarian Exarch as a usurper, and the Bulgarian autonomous Church as schismatic, they see in the person of the Patriarch of Constantinople the only canonical authority on whom all the orthodox subjects of the Ottoman State should depend.

“The confusion of religious and civil privileges in Turkish administration has served this principle, and the Greek clergy occupied all the provinces of Macedonia.

“National sentiment, with more or less consciousness, and the identity of language, have since succeeded in persuading the Exarchist villages to join the Bulgarian Church. But these influences were not everywhere strong enough to triumph over a propaganda pushed actively by an enterprising clergy.

“Many Macedonian villages are called, and consider themselves, Greek, whilst they exclusively employ Bulgarian as their language and are dependent on the Exarch. The instructions of the Exarch prohibit the Bulgarian clergy from any association in the work of political propaganda, and all resistance to the movement conducted by the Greek clergy. The latter take advantage of the aid afforded them by the Greek committee, and inwardly approve the proclamations which this committee circulates, and which are drawn up in the form of an ultimatum.

“‘Brethren,’ says one of these last circulars, distributed in the Exarchist villages of southern Macedonia, ‘recognise the truth! The Bulgarian committee has been abolished. Our committee is the only one existing now.

Think! We give you ten days in which to return to your ancient faith, and to confess that you are Greeks, as all the books of the world prove. If you do not submit, great calamities will befall your village. Amen.'

"The result of such manifestoes, whose conditions are announced without circumlocution, and of the persecutions which follow such threats, is shown in the yearly increasing numbers of emigrants from Macedonia. Statistics drawn up at Salonica show that 3000 Bulgarians left Macedonia in 1904 for America, 7000 in 1905 and 15,000 in 1906. It is thus clear that the result will be the depopulation of Macedonia.

"But who can apply to-day the remedy for the disease? The Greek Government has often been accused of fomenting an anti-Bulgarian movement, so one cannot expect contrary measures from the Government of Athens. Besides, if the Greek frontier was closed to the bands the influence of the Greco-Macedonian committee has such foundations as to render it impossible for any organ on that side to restrain the mania of Greco-Bulgarian hostilities.

"Turkey sees with great pleasure two Christian nations tearing at each other's throats. Greece in the present instance is doing the work of the Sultan very well. In Constantinople they are very certain that they can put a stop to Greek claims in Macedonia whenever they wish, so that the Porte need not intervene in the quarrel.

"There are thus the European Powers left. But apart from the well-known reasons which have for so long rendered impossible any adjustment of their interests in the East, there is another difficulty for them, viz.: the incompatibility of two nationalities, both Christian, both orthodox, and the extent of their hostilities, which is the Gordian knot of the Macedonian problem."

Under the heading "Deeds, many deeds—on paper," the Bulgarian paper *Voice of Pyrgos* publishes the following article against the Bulgarian Government:

"I do not think of denying that the atrocities of the Greek bands in Macedonia have provoked reprisals against Greeks in Bulgaria. The last movement, however, with

its terrible consequences, was not provoked by those bands—the bands have been for a long time wasting Macedonia—but by the reports of the union of Crete with Greece.

“Our readers will remember how the Government newspapers expressed their astonishment at Bulgarian patience on the first rumours of the union of Crete with Greece. And surprise on the part of the Government always conveys a threat. When the threat upon paper did not help, the Government permitted the anti-Greek movement. We think it superfluous to repeat that the opportunity for an anti-Greek movement was prepared a long time beforehand, thanks especially to the double-faced policy of the Government.

“The Government made use of the anti-Greek movement, in the hope that this would postpone the union of Crete with Greece and the dispatch of Greek bands into Macedonia. But this calculation proved mistaken.

“Crete, if not formally, is at any rate substantially *de facto* united with Greece, and King George now appoints its Governor-General directly. While the Greek bands in Macedonia have not only not decreased, but on the contrary have increased since the anti-Greek movement, and have allied themselves with Servian bands for the annihilation of Bulgarianism, official Greece itself, by the facilities which she affords to the Greeks who are emigrating from Bulgaria, declares that she has no intention of altering her policy in Macedonia. As soon as our Government, therefore, saw that it gained nothing of what it expected from the anti-Greek movement, it forthwith put a stop to it.

“Instead then of the results expected by the Government, we have absolutely negative results. Crete has been united to Greece, the Greek bands have increased in Macedonia, and Bulgaria has been disgraced by permitting the outrages.

“We have to-day an inquiry into the destruction of Anchialos, in which Bulgarians are implicated; another into the circumstances of a robbery in which—why

should we conceal it?—the police are implicated; and a third . . . but there is no end of them.”

“At Pyrgos we have law-suits about the seizure of churches and schools which are in the occupation of the municipal authorities. We have an indictment for the theft (?) of arms without any private prosecutor and without any prisoner. What else is there? There is everything which can be done by rulers who have lost their heads. The most serious part of this confusion is that the actions thus brought cancel one another, and only result in chaos that has been formed from the stench of which many noses will suffer. This, of course, does not stop dozens of people being imprisoned, guilty and innocent. We say guilty and innocent, indeed, because there would be no question of Greeks or Bulgarians being guilty if the Government had not permitted the movement to attain such dimensions. Of breaking the public peace no one is more guilty than the Government itself. It is immoral on the part of the Government, after ruining the Greeks and compromising the credulous Bulgarians, to throw them both into prison.

“For this reason it is indispensable that an amnesty should be proclaimed for all the crimes committed in the anti-Greek movement. But the amnesty would have no significance unless an end were finally put to the abuses perpetrated by the authorities.”

The same Bulgarian paper, in reply to a declaration made by the Minister Petkoff, makes the following accusation :

“The Minister Petkoff has informed the Chamber, in reply to M. S. Botsoff, that it is not true that the Greeks are terrorised in the vicinity of Pyrgos [Bourgas]. The truth, however, is that in the neighbourhood of Pyrgos, and especially in the Greek centres, anarchy is prevalent. It pains us to make this statement, but we consider that silence in such circumstances is a crime, and we should like to know the policy of the powers that be—if, indeed, the prevalent anarchy admits of a policy at all.

“These are the more recent facts :

“(1) Michael Alikoglou, of Anchialos, was beaten almost to death at the place named Soka, and his flock was stolen from him. He is now at Mesemvria, and we hear that he has since died. The culprits were two comitadjis.

“(2) At the small inn on the Anchialos-Pyrgos road armed comitadjis held up the merchants Rodeff and Tineff, from whom they demanded money. The same comitadjis fired into the inn.

“(3) On the way from Anchialos to Thermæ, Manuel Tabacoglou, from Anchialos, was robbed by comitadjis, who took from him 260 fr.

“(4) Three comitadjis at Anchialos attacked by night and flogged George Leblebedji.

“These events have all happened within one week, and are all attested by witnesses. If this is how the situation created by the authorities is strengthened and protected—for this is how M. Petkoff’s answer must be interpreted—it is not strange that the Greeks are emigrating, and that even Bulgarians are following their example.”

The *Bulgaria*, commenting on the speech of the Prince in the Sobranje, with reference especially to the paragraph reading, “Europe has commenced to look up to the Bulgarian principality as an important factor of civilisation,” remarks that “all the evil which has been done, and which is still being done daily in this country, such as brigandage, arson, robbery with violence, theft, and in general all the attempts on the lives, property, and honour of our fellow-citizens, of whatever nationality, tend to certify that our country has become an important factor of disorder.

“Besides, the attitude of the Great Powers and of the European Press shows clearly enough how Bulgaria is being judged abroad.”

The Bulgarian paper *Den* also, on October 20, accuses the followers of Gennadieff of “provoking the anti-

Greek disturbances which have so much injured Bulgaria, solely and only for financial reasons."

The following is a letter received from a correspondent at Pyrgos, dated August 16, 1906 :

"The Greek population of our town, like that of all the Bulgarian towns, is in despair and terror. The Greeks only venture out of their houses in order to buy their victuals, and are obliged to shut up their houses early under threat of death from the comitadjis.

"Three days ago the Bulgarian patriots made a fresh attack on Greek houses and shops. They destroyed and looted the shop of Em. Karagiozi.

"Commerce is at a standstill and all credit has been stopped. The poor Greeks, here and elsewhere, do not know what to do, and flee where fate leads them, abandoning their property, small or large, in order to escape with their lives.

"You will perhaps be surprised to learn that although the Minister of the Interior (M. Petkoff) dismissed the Prefect of Pyrgos, this dismissal has had no influence on the condition of affairs. Do you seriously believe that the Government disapproved of these outrages? If they had wished to do so, could they not have prevented them? And what are they doing now, when so many crimes are being committed against the Greeks, in order to show their good faith?

"I will relate only one incident to give you an idea of the difference between what the Bulgarians say and what they do.

"M. Petkoff, who visited our town after the commission of the outrages, promised the inhabitants of Pyrgos and Anchialos that all the churches which had been seized, as well as the schools, would be returned to them, and that the burnt houses would be rebuilt at the Government's expense. Three days afterwards, however, Sismanoff, the Minister of Education, appointed teachers in the school here which was, only twenty-five days before, Greek, and changed it into a Bulgarian commercial school! This incident is characteristic of the words

and deeds of the two Ministers of the Stambouloff party.

"On the 12th instant the Greek steamer *Antigone* sailed from here with two hundred and fifty families of refugees from Anchialos. Oh, if you could have witnessed that scene! If you could have seen men and women, without boots, in tattered clothes, hungry, miserable, and mourning the loss of dear relations, abandoning their ruined houses, the land in which they lived. . . ."

The Bulgarian diplomatic agent at Constantinople, M. Natsevitch, on tendering his resignation said: "The three years which I passed at my post at Constantinople were for me years of martyrdom, which I could no longer bear on hearing of the destruction of Anchialos. I suffered through this event both as diplomatic agent and as a Bulgarian, and on this account I did not hesitate to hand in my resignation." And the present Prime Minister Petkoff seemed to be speaking the truth when, on visiting Anchialos after the destruction, he exclaimed to his attendants, "These crimes will cost Bulgaria dear." But as a matter of fact Europe has not been moved to indignation by the Bulgarian outrages. Bulgaria is applauded everywhere. She is the state of the future!

But it would be an injustice to the whole European Press if one were to impute to it complete silence and indifference to these crimes. A great many papers did protest, and stigmatised in a proper manner the authors of the outrages.

One of the most important Austrian papers, the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of Vienna, published a long article under the heading "Hellenism in Bulgaria," of which the following are extracts:

"The anti-Greek movement in the Bulgarian principality still continues. But this time the Bulgarian authorities have taken severe measures against the instigators. At Sofia they have at last come to realise that a state of affairs in which the scum of the streets

rules public life should not be allowed to become chronic.

"The annihilation and Bulgarisation of the Greek element in Bulgaria would bring with it heavy commercial losses and disadvantages to the principality. The extreme value of the Greek element as regards Bulgarian commerce is the outcome of historical development, and its violent destruction would necessarily cause to the Bulgarian State a most deep injury.

"The realisation of this truth and shame for the horrible work of August and September have induced the Bulgarian Government to take strong measures against the lawless mob.

"But the Bulgarian Government must not stop at half measures, nor will it be able to do so. It will be compelled, on the contrary, to clearly declare and give assurances that it does not desire to derive any benefit from the crimes of the mob. The destruction of the whole Greek organisation is a work of the lowest nature of the Bulgarian mob, of the 'Bulgarian brute.'

"It is hence obvious that the first and indispensable condition of the maintenance of the civil authority above the will of the mob must necessarily be the restoration of the status existing before the lawless raids of the Bulgarian malcontents.

"It is the State's simple obligation and duty, imposed by elementary justice, to restore the sixteen churches seized, as well as the three monasteries and the eighteen schools, together with their belongings, to the representatives of the Œcumenical Patriarchate and the Greek ecclesiastical communities in Bulgaria. But the restitution of the church property seized must include those buildings which the Bulgarian communities claim as their own property, as they were taken by force from their actual possessors.

"The Bulgarisation of the Greek schools aimed at by the Nationalist agitators through the renewal of the Stambouloff law relating to schools seems both useless and unjust."

I here insert some articles published by the chief

Continental newspapers in connection with the outrages in Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia. The *Fremdenblatt* writes as follows :

“The racial struggle in the Balkan Peninsula has already been productive of fearful events. After the recent cases in which Greek churches and Greek schools were taken by assault in Eastern Rumelia, yesterday the infuriated mob consigned a whole town to the flames. Anchialos has for the most part been transformed into a heap of ruins ; many of the inhabitants have perished, and those who succeeded in saving their lives have fled to the hills in order to escape falling into the hands of their merciless enemies after the destruction of their homes.

“The outbreak of hatred against the Greeks of Macedonia is indeed the result of the activity of Greek bands in Macedonia, which have step by step pushed back the Bulgarians. But these bands are a Bulgarian invention ; and in the very interior of the country, where the Bulgarian element is mingled with populations speaking a different tongue or constitutes a minority of the population, the Bulgarian bands had boldly ventured and carried on propaganda for their national cause by outrages of every kind, by raids and assaults, by arson, assassination, and violation.”

Further on, speaking of the activity of the Greek bands in Macedonia by which the Bulgarian brigands were completely exterminated, the article continues :

“In this manner Hellenism was enabled to progress in Macedonia, whilst in Bulgaria, where Macedonia is already looked upon as national property, it produced fear and rage, and, as we have seen, gave rise to a purely fanatical movement. The successes of the Greek bands caused such an outbreak of hatred against the Greeks that the Greek minorities in Eastern Rumelia are threatened with extermination, and any attempt on their part to resist only aggravates the evil. The Bulgarians use the Greeks of Eastern Rumelia as hostages, and for

every square mile of territory lost in the south a bloody account is presented in the north. . . .

"The Bulgarian Government, which promised after the first outbreaks to do all in its power to protect the Greeks, and which indeed restrains the mob in the larger towns by troops, had no desire to prevent the disaster of Anchialos."

The Viennese *Allgemeine Zeitung* very impartially describes the state of affairs. The article appears under the heading "The Lesson of Anchialos" :

"The atrocities of Kishineff and of Gomel have been left far behind by those of Anchialos, which on Sunday last was the theatre of most fearful scenes. But it is to-day known for certain and indisputably that the Bulgarian Government and the Bulgarian nation itself stand before Europe terribly compromised.

"How could it possibly happen, in view of the recent occurrences at Philippopolis, Stenimachos, Pyrgos, Cernabad, and Mesemvria, that the authorities of the principality took no preventive measures to preclude the attack on Anchialos, which was openly planned and carefully prepared with the help of the peasantry from the neighbouring villages? And how did it possibly occur that a whole town in the middle of Bulgaria could be burnt to the ground without the authorities of the principality showing any opposition, without the troops called from Pyrgos, only two and a half hours distant, doing anything to prevent it, even by firing if necessary on the mob, without any one raising a finger, on behalf of the grievously offended civil authority and on behalf of the national honour, against the incendiaries and assassins, who raged like maniacs for a whole day and ran through the whole list of the most abominable crimes? . . . However many outrages may have been committed of late years by the bands of Albanian, Bulgarian, Rumanian, and Servian brigands in Macedonia, the horror of Anchialos puts all else in the shade. It shows in bloody letters, lit up by the flames of the conflagration, what would be the fate of Macedonia if the Powers were

to detach it from the body of the Turkish Empire as an autonomous province, and were to entrust it to Bulgarian authorities.

"The urgent necessity is shown for some common action to be taken by the Powers, and for the Government of Sofia to be categorically informed not only that the hideous acts of barbarism from Philippopolis to Anchialos exclude the Bulgarian principality from the ranks of civilised states, but also that the Powers will by no means and on no condition tolerate the repetition of such outrages.

"Now only is it that one recognises the wise and prudent foresight of the Powers assembled at Berlin which pushed back Bulgaria from the Ægean Sea and preserved Cavalla for Turkey. For while in the Greek towns of Pyrgos [Bourgas], Anchialos, and Varna, which were entrusted to Bulgaria in 1878, the Greeks, who form the most enterprising and progressive part of the population, are continually molested, persecuted, tyrannised, and robbed, the Greek Cavalla, which was at the same time snatched from the hands of the Bulgarians, has under Turkish rule from a small village of only 8000 inhabitants become a rich, flourishing, and prosperous town with a population of 40,000.

"It is thus clearly and indisputably shown that the rule of the Sultan in Macedonia is at any rate preferable to the bloody 'civilising methods' of New Bulgaria. . . ."

The *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* also criticises the events very severely :

"The eyes of the world are turned to-day horror-stricken towards Bulgaria, where the unrestrained rage against everything that is Greek has occasioned in each locality a true disaster. How the Bulgarians raged and raved against the Greek inhabitants of Philippopolis, Stenimachos, and other towns our readers have already learnt from long descriptions, and they also know that the Bulgarian Government hastened to declare to Europe that it disapproved of what had occurred in the country,

and would take care to prevent any future repetition of the events.

“How did the Bulgarian Government devote its activity to the prevention of new outbreaks of the rage of the mob against the Greeks? This was very soon shown. In every corner, in every street and square, new anti-Greek meetings were held, quite undisturbed by the police or the troops; at each meeting resolutions were acclaimed, proposing a merciless persecution and extermination of the Greeks; and, after a methodical organisation of the mob, there occurred yesterday a fearful catastrophe, unique even in the history of Oriental savagery.

“The official Bulgarian reports state that the Greeks attempted to frustrate the meeting. But how? ‘By barricading themselves in their churches and houses,’ is the reply given from Sofia!”

The Vienna journal proceeds to pull to pieces the contentions coming from Sofia as to the causes provoking the catastrophe, and to emphasise the guilt of the Bulgarian Government.

The German *Vossische Zeitung* wrote with regard to the events of Anchialos:

“What does Europe say to this? What does that Europe say which designed to watch over the tranquillity of the Balkan Peninsula, and which, in virtue of the stipulations of the Treaty of Berlin, is entitled to intervene in some way on account of the latest occurrences in Bulgaria?”

“So far as is known to-day, Europe says absolutely nothing, but keeps silence, as she evidently has no wish to put her hand into a fresh hornets’ nest. It is certain that if some Christian Church in Turkey was simply desecrated by an unrestrained crowd having no connection with the Government, the usual cry of indignation would resound through the world (especially in England); and in the various Parliaments the Governments would not be able to find threats sufficiently severe to condemn, as we said, a simple profanation, and not a forcible seizure

of a church from its owners. But when it is a question of the siege and seizure of Greek churches, and of other abominable outrages perpetrated by the Bulgarian people—Europe is silent.”

Even the philo-Bulgarian *Noroe Vremya*, with all its sophisms and attempts to justify the Bulgarians, calls the riots “regrettable incidents,” while the *Dvatesatey Viek*, in an article under the heading “Slavism in danger,” amongst other remarks concerning Macedonia, which it fears will become Austrian, Albanian, or Greek, and not Slav, concludes with the remark that “they should not attack unarmed citizens.”

The important daily paper of St. Petersburg, *Pieterburski Vyedomost*, writes as follows :

“During the last few weeks reports have been received from Philippopolis, Burgas, Varna, and other towns and villages of Southern Bulgaria, of acts of robbery and violence committed on the Greeks, all of which were of the same description. The Bulgarian mob falls on the Greek churches, destroying the Greek ecclesiastical books, and seizes and destroys the Greek shops—in a word, perpetrates the same kind of pre-arranged riot as the Russian pogroms. The Greek churches are seized on the pretext that they were, forsooth, built with Bulgarian money. At Varna they prevented by a hostile demonstration the landing of the Greek Archbishop, on the pretext that the Patriarch had not considered it necessary to communicate his appointment to the Bulgarian Government.

“It seems that the Bulgarian Government, by secretly supporting the mob in its persecution of the Greek Church in Bulgaria, aims at nothing other than the subjection of the latter to the civil authority of the principality; and the Bulgarian people is so inimically disposed towards the Greeks that there is no need of particular reasons for attacking them.

“The Greeks are hated in Bulgaria, not only for political but also for social reasons. They have supplanted the

Bulgarians not only in the commercial towns on the coast, where they have concentrated in their hands all the maritime trade and shipping business, but in the towns of the interior of Eastern Rumelia, where all the wholesale as well as part of the retail trade is in their hands. In the arts, in their way of dealing with customers, &c., they are dangerous competitors. As hotel-keepers, clerks, hairdressers, and in every other employment which requires a certain amount of civility, they are more successful than Bulgarians. Even in the service of the Government there is a large number of Greeks. Formerly educated Bulgarians were rare. The Greeks, with that intelligence which distinguishes them, availed themselves of their opportunity, and occupied many important posts. Under these circumstances it is not at all strange that the Bulgarians dislike the Greeks. It is only necessary to add to this the defiant attitude of the Greek clergy, who openly look down upon the Exarchists, and the outrages against the Greeks are easily accounted for.

“The Bulgarian Government has a whole army corps at Philippopolis, but notwithstanding this they took no measures to put down the disturbances. It is here supposed that the Bulgarian Government played the part of a mere spectator, because they hoped for the support of Austria.”

The *Cologne Gazette*, which always examines the affairs of the East with calmness and impartiality, is the only paper in Germany which speaks from a complete knowledge of the question without being either a victim or an instrument of individuals or parties. If it has any politics, they are purely German, for its articles often bear a semi-official character.

On July 19 the *Cologne Gazette* published in its second morning edition the following leading article on the recent outrages :

“The general feeling in Bulgaria against the activity of the Greek bands in Macedonia is alleged to be the cause of the recent outrages. On the other hand, it is certain that they were organised by agitators. At any

rate, the Bulgarian police, which does not in any case enjoy a reputation for excessive foresight, did not intervene, and it ought to be ascertained whether this was owing to its inefficiency or to connivance.

“The year 1872 gave to the Bulgarians an Exarch of their own, who has now become an adversary of the Œcumenical Patriarch, and has gained strong support by the establishment of Bulgaria as a principality and by the union with Eastern Rumelia. The population of these two countries has for the most part joined the Exarchate, and only at Philippopolis, Stenimachos, the seaports of the Black Sea, and a few other places are there still Greek communities, which are being gradually crushed out of existence.

“The Œcumenical Patriarchate can justly complain of numerous illegal oppressions and interferences. The dissension between the orthodox and the Exarchists became intensified when the struggle in Macedonia developed into a bloody war between the bands of the two nationalities.

“But the commencement of this phase of the struggle is due to the Bulgarians. With the fall of Stamboulouff the policy of the ‘peaceful penetration’ of Macedonia by means of schools and churches came to an end, and the propagandists commenced a work which had terrible results.

“That work provoked the armed defence of the Greek and Servian followers of the Patriarchate.

“Under these conditions the state of the orthodox in Bulgaria naturally goes from bad to worse. The Macedonian committees in the principality create an agitation against the Greeks by every means in their power, and have repeatedly urged the necessity of removing all the orthodox from the public service. They see in the latter a dangerous element; and indeed, two years ago, when a conflict with Turkey seemed imminent, both Mussulman *and* Greek recruits were rejected.

“Anyhow, the Bulgarian Government has so far refrained from taking exceptional measures against the orthodox, so long as the latter have not committed

breaches of the law, but it has seized every opportunity which has presented itself in order to weaken the influence of the Patriarchate."

The *Neue Freie Presse*, in another article, claims that these demonstrations, instead of putting an end to the latest irritation between the Governments of Sofia and Athens, will contribute to its aggravation, and will have deplorable consequences in Macedonia, where Greece seems to be prevailing.

The *Pester Lloyd*, commenting in a leading article on the outrages at Sofia, after particularly emphasising the cheers and applause of the Bulgarian mob before the residence of the British agent, asks, "What is the reason of this especial manifestation of the Bulgarian demonstrators in favour of the British agent and the British Government, while no such unrestrained enthusiasm was displayed before the other diplomatic agencies?"

The semi-official *Fremdenblatt*, criticising the causes of the disturbances, observes that the abnormal condition of Macedonia was created by the principality itself, by the assembly and dispatch of bands long before the other Macedonian bands commenced their campaign, which only imitated methods originally Bulgarian.

"How can Bulgaria dare to protest and to hold Turkey responsible for what is happening in Macedonia, when she herself is alone responsible for the internecine struggle into which she has driven the Greeks?"

The *Independance Belge* comments as follows :

"The serious occurrences which have taken place at Cavarna in Bulgaria, where the mob took possession of the Greek Church, and the Greek school, and at the same time committed various outrages on the shops of Greeks, again draw attention to the burning question of the struggle between nationalities which has created such a dangerous condition throughout the Levant. It is clear that the Bulgarian Government cannot be held

responsible for these outrages, especially as the Prefect of this town had promised to protect the Greek community, and the mob took advantage of his absence to commit the excesses which have been announced."

"We wrote yesterday," continues the *Independance Belge* in its next issue, "that the Government of Sofia would certainly hasten to clear itself of all responsibility for the lamentable anti-Greek demonstrations committed on Bulgarian soil. The Greek representative has protested against the demonstrations at Philippopolis, and has demanded an indemnity for the excesses committed, and the Government of Sofia has immediately given orders for the arrest and punishment of the guilty parties."

In view of these crimes, which the Bulgarians themselves have acknowledged either in the Press or in their Parliament to have been perpetrated, and which have aroused the protests and indignation of the Press throughout Europe, what has been done by official Europe and unofficial England? My duty is to declare publicly that almost the entire responsibility for the crimes lies, not with the Greco-Macedonian bands which for the last three years have acted in self defence, but with the Bulgarian committees. More than once England, through its Foreign Office, has protested against the defence by Greeks of Macedonians, and has asked for the punishment of the so-called responsible Greek Metropolitans. Public opinion, misled by certain members of the Balkan Committee and by the Sofia correspondent of the *Times*—who, as is well known, supports the worn-out theory of a Greater Bulgaria reaching as far as Salonica and Mount Olympus, and destined to create a strong anti-Russian bulwark, to the advantage (save the mark!) of the straitened kingdom of Greece (as if the Hellenic idea were confined to the free state, and as if Hellenism were not full of a strong vitality in Macedonia, in Thrace, in Epirus, in the *Ægean*, and in Asia Minor)—public opinion has, through various organs, with the *Times* at their head, declared war upon the Greek bands

in Macedonia, and has absolved the malefactors of Sofia, who are struggling against the Turks in order to found a great Christian state, including, together with the present territory of Bulgaria, Macedonia and Thrace and the rest of the Balkan Peninsula, with the adjacent Greek islands !

There exist declarations of not a few responsible English politicians, belonging for the most part to the Liberal Party, to the effect that the solution of the Eastern question depends upon the creation of a large and strong Bulgarian state, capable of taking the place of the daily declining and decomposing power of Turkey. Hence the interest exerted by official England, especially during the last three years, on behalf of Bulgaria.

Omitting previous declarations and expressions of sympathy, I quote a few such expressions uttered after the recent catastrophes in Eastern Rumelia.

In the first place, the *Tribune*, commenting upon the declarations of the new Premier of Bulgaria in the *Sobranje*, said :

“ A confidential follower of Stambouloff, he has inherited from the latter his method of settling the difficulties of Bulgaria with Turkey by means of negotiations, and basing himself upon a correct attitude of compelling the Powers to take upon themselves the work of reform in Macedonia. . . . The chief point in his declarations is the announcement that he intends to ask the Chamber to vote fresh military expenditure. The Bulgarian army is now in a splendid condition as regards its value, and all the guns which are necessary have been ordered. To speak, therefore, about fresh preparations is as though he wished to declare that the danger is real and imminent.”

When, in November last, Mr. Dillon in the House of Commons asked the Secretary for Foreign Affairs if the Bulgarian Government had brought to the notice of the Powers the recent murders of Bulgarians at Karatjamoi, Sir Edward Grey replied that the crimes in question had come to the knowledge of the British Government, but not through a Bulgarian note. He added that, according

to existing information, the perpetrators of the murders were Greeks.

While the majority of the English Press congratulated the Bulgarians on the warlike declarations and threats of their politicians, the speech of the Greek Premier, M. Theotokis, in the Chamber, was commented upon very unfavourably.

The *Times* characterised M. Theotokis's pronouncements as astonishing, and it expressed the opinion that humanity has nothing to gain from them. It added that the Greek Government, in calling to-day for the expedition of the work of reform in Macedonia, does this in order that it may not be behind the rest of the Balkan States.

IV

THE POLITICAL BULGARIAN IN MACEDONIA

THE directors of the Bulgarian revolutionary movement in Macedonia since the annexation of Eastern Rumelia at first attempted to convert the Macedonian populations to Bulgarism, through a *rapprochement* with the Turkish Government and by means of the school and clergy.

This was the programme of the Bulgarian Exarchate in the year 1885, and it was adopted and put into force by every violent and fraudulent means during the political ascendancy of Stambouloff.

In that historical year for the principality when Eastern Rumelia was annexed by a *coup d'état* to the newly established principality, and the decisions of the Berlin Congress were set at naught, with the applause of the principal participants in the Congress, a book was published in the Bulgarian language, and subsequently in French, entitled "Macedonia on the Thousandth Anniversary of St. Methodios." A thousand years had just passed since the conversion of the Bulgarians to Christianity, and the Bulgarian Exarchate was celebrating this great event in the Slavonic world by publications and commemorations.

The author of the work was the secretary of the Bulgarian Exarchate, Athanasios Shopoff, who wrote under the pseudonym of "Opheikoff"; and it was published as a kind of programme of the policy to be followed in Macedonia to bring about in the quickest and easiest way the realisation of the "Bulgarian idea" in that country.

"The cradle of Christianity for the Slav races is Macedonia, the native land of the Saints Cyril and Methodios. But, alas! to-day this country is profoundly unhappy; it dare not call itself Slav, it dare not speak its native

tongue." And further on : " Our future," the author cries, " is Macedonia ; it is the reawakening of the Macedonian Bulgarians, for our greatness, our future national unity, our very existence as a Balkan State will be of no avail if we do not aim at this ideal. In Macedonia we ought to labour in time to come. Salonica ought to be the chief town of our country, Salonica ought to be the chief window that lights the edifice. Let us work, then, in Macedonia ! "

Always, according to this author, the one enemy of Bulgarism is the Greek. In narrating the evils from which his compatriots suffer, he puts them all down to the accounts of the Greeks and to the Œcumenical Patriarchate. From the treasury of the Patriarchate, he says, flow all the revenues destined for the enlightenment of Macedonia, or rather for the Hellenisation of the Macedonians, and in consequence for the destruction of the Bulgarians. Greece is the most dangerous rival, and it would not be surprising if it one day conquered in Macedonia ! "

How, then, should this enemy be fought ? The answer is simple: By the schoolmaster and by the priest. Through them there will be created in Macedonia a national Bulgarian feeling. The writer declares that the country will be for ever lost to his party if they do not consecrate themselves, at the cost of the greatest sacrifices, to revive it, to inspire it with new strength, to endow it with a younger generation so brought up that it will not fear to confess its nationality, and will know how to die so that the national cause may triumph.

" Macedonia," the author adds, " will not be Bulgarised except through the schools. But this compels continual sacrifice, untiring activity. After creating a national feeling, the question of a revised census of the inhabitants must be raised."

Again : " To act effectively in Macedonia, to be able to fight against Hellenism, to preserve the Bulgarian nationality for the inhabitants, *we ought to remain friendly to the Turks* till the moment is come to act by fire and sword. . . . To triumph over the Greek in

Macedonia we ought to seek an alliance with the Turks, without which we cannot succeed. . . ." The secretary of the Exarchate ends his stirring appeal to the Bulgarian people by summing up the chief object of his solicitude : "For the good of our country, for the success of our enterprise, *let us act in accord with the Turks*, let us preserve the most amicable relations with them. . . ."

This policy, which has been enforced for twenty years and more, has not proved successful. The harvest has not been worthy of the seed. Hellenism, in spite of the attacks of many and various opponents, has proved strong both in Macedonia and in Thrace, and there is no hope of its giving way or of its being assimilated in the crucible of Bulgarian policy.¹

On this account a change of policy became necessary in both the above divisions of the Balkan Peninsula.

The chief founder of the new programme of action in Macedonia is the former Bulgarian commercial agent at Skopja, M. Rizoff. In a memorandum of his—an open letter—to Prince Ferdinand in the year 1898 he condemned the then prevailing method of the Exarchate, according to which the plan of campaign in Macedonia ought to be confined to the cultivation and development of the population annexed by the church and school.

M. Rizoff opines that "this kind of work should be left to the exclusive care of the Exarchate, but Bulgaria should collect all her strength and direct it towards the deliverance of Macedonia, because the longer the present state of affairs continues in Macedonia, our opponents gain, while we fall into a worse state. All that we can obtain in a friendly manner from the Turks for our Macedonian brethren we have already gained.

"Every concession made to us by Turkey, even supposing that such are still possible, would injure rather than be of advantage to us, because it would cost more than it is worth, and would divert us from our chief mission.

"Turkey would no longer be in a position, even if she wished, to introduce reforms into Macedonia. But she has not the slightest desire to do so, as is evident from

the furnishing of the Turkish and Albanian population with arms and ammunition.

"The only reforms possible in Turkey are those provided in the 23rd Article of the Berlin Treaty, and the only possible method of realising the reforms is the granting of autonomy under the control and protection of Europe, and afterwards annexation (like that of Eastern Rumelia, as the *Cologne Gazette* observes).

"Nothing can be more easy and more simple than the achievement of these reforms if only Russia, France, and England would each send a regiment to Salonica, Vitolia, and Skopeia, and at the same time send their united fleets to the Gulf of Salonica.

"Every one who knows the psychology of the Turk and the state of feeling of the Macedonian population could wager his head that not a single Turkish or Albanian gun would be fired directly a European army occupied the above-mentioned chief towns of the three vilayets . . . and Bulgaria should therefore bend all her forces in order to place the Macedonian question as soon as possible upon the order of the day of European diplomacy. But what Bulgaria ought in no case to do is the following: In the first place, she ought not to come to any arrangement with any of the Balkan States with regard to a possible division of Macedonia or a definition of spheres of influence in that country. With the Balkan States one arrangement only is possible, that is their adhesion to the efforts of Bulgaria for the autonomy of Macedonia."

These ideas of the Bulgarian diplomatist, accompanied by a most active propaganda in Macedonia, have not been without fruit. Both official and private circles in Bulgaria understand that the peaceable propaganda of church and school, or the wresting of ecclesiastical privileges (berats, bishoprics) from Turkey by political manœuvres, would not promote the Bulgarian idea in that country. A new system was therefore commenced for the Bulgarianisation of Macedonia. This was laid down in the most violent and shameless manner at Belgrade by Boris

Sarafoff four years ago. "Since the school and the church have not succeeded in the Bulgarisation of Macedonia, it is necessary for us to adopt more practical and more efficient measures, viz., dynamite and incendiarism."

These are the new dogmas of the revolutionary school of New Bulgaria!

Hence the campaign of the Bulgarian committees in order to upheave Macedonia and the vilayet of Adrianople, a campaign which commenced in the year 1902, but which attained its acme in 1903. This policy was especially manifested after the Shipka celebrations, when General Ignatieff, the creator of Bulgaria and leader of Panslavism, visited that country, and when later on the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Lamsdorff, visited the two neighbouring courts of Belgrade and Sofia.

General Ignatieff, addressing a deputation of Bulgarian patriots, said among other things: "I have loved the Bulgarians since 1862. I love all the Bulgarians. I make no exception whatever between free and enslaved. One only exception do I make: I love exceedingly enslaved Macedonia!

"For the establishment of peace in the Balkan Peninsula I have discovered a recipe—the Bulgaria of San Stefano; but for reasons outside of my will this recipe, this treaty, cannot be put into effect.

"I, Count Ignatieff, alive or dead, advise the Bulgarians, and bequeath to them the advice, to hand down from father to son, that Bulgaria of San Stefano must be realised.

"I bequeath to the Bulgarian nation the advice to work, to strive, to contend, and to fight to prevent any part, even a village—a single man—to be detached from the Bulgaria of San Stefano."

This is the advice given by the apostle of Panslavism in the capital of Bulgaria in 1902 during the Shipka festivities. The revolutionary committees, after hearing these provocative words, were yet more encouraged in the pursuit of their Macedonian policy.

Boris Sarafoff and the select adherents of the Great

Bulgaria idea commenced in 1902, and continued with greater zest in 1903, the method of dynamite and incendiarism.

In this manner the invasion of Macedonia by the gangs of the committees commenced, and this movement was called by the philo-Bulgarian circle in Europe a "Macedonian revolution." Crime followed crime in the name of the freedom of Macedonia.

I give descriptions and criticisms of these unspeakable outrages against everything sacred and divine from the official depositions, documents, and reports from European sources, as well as from Bulgarian circles.

In the first place, I insert extracts from the reports of Sir Alfred Biliotti, British Consul-General at Salonica at the time :

In April 1902 the following despatch was sent to his Government by Sir Alfred Biliotti: "The insecurity which exists now to a certain extent is caused by just those people who complain most of it. In fact, besides the permanent and inherent defects of the Turkish administration, there is nothing at this moment to justify the anxiety manifested in the Press so far as the Turkish population is concerned, Rayahs on the whole being left unmolested. But Bulgarian bands, which had for a time interrupted their murders, have begun again to assassinate Christians of other races, as well as Moslems. Hitherto neither of these parties has retaliated on a scale worthy of notice, but their position is becoming very precarious, and Greeks, Servians, and Vlachs, as well as Moslems, are complaining in emphatic terms of the proceedings of the Bulgarian bands and of the consequent behaviour of the Bulgarian population. The Christians (Bulgarian excepted) and Moslems close the doors of their houses at sunset. These proceedings of the Macedonian committees have brought about a veritable reign of terror among all the inhabitants of this region, which contains a large number of Bulgarians."

On October 11 the same Consul-General wrote to his Ambassador: "Those among the Christians who have a

certain influence on their co-religionists, at the first sign of resistance to the views of the committee are murdered, with the double object of getting rid of them and of striking the whole population with terror. Regular lists of proscription have been found by the authorities on some of the Bulgarians killed in encounters. The Macedonian committee has drawn up registers taxing each Christian according to his means, and any one refusing to pay is executed. Under these circumstances the Christians, after paying taxes to the Government, have to pay a second taxation to the committee, besides providing with food all members of bands coming to their villages, and who are shortly after followed by gendarmes, supposed to pursue them. I am informed that in some cases bribery makes the gendarmes close their eyes."

Another despatch of the Consul-General at Salonica, dated December 9, 1902, is thus conceived: "The Macedonian committees have employed a double method of action; they sought first to reawaken by propagandist literature the national feeling among the villagers, and to detach them from the Œcumenical Patriarchate, and on the other hand, by means of the bands traversing the country during the summer, they tried to attract them by promises or force them by threats to join the movement. Proselytism and terrorism were the means by which they sought to utterly destroy all tranquillity and to reduce the inhabitants of the district to such complete misery as would force them to fall in with their revolutionary ideas. Little by little they removed all those who, faithful to the Patriarchate, refused their allegiance, and in the sandjak of Serres alone over 100 Greeks, Vlachs, and Orthodox Bulgarians fell victims to their vengeance and cruelty. The committees, then, have succeeded by means of their agents, the schoolmasters and priests, during the year, and of the bands and the terror these inspire during the summer, in withdrawing from the Patriarchate mostly all the villages of Djuma, Bala, and Razlog, and most of the villages of Melnik, Petritch, and Neyrocop."

Sir Alfred Biliotti, after having described the first phase of the section of the committees, passes on to the manner in which the bands coming from Bulgaria invaded Macedonia. He described different battles which had occurred, and added (pp. 282, 283): "On the whole, a very small number of peasants actually took part in the fights; the majority followed their wives and children to the mountains to protect them. Not one single village took part willingly in the movement or emigrated of its own initiative. They were all induced to by promises, threats, and even murder by the promoters of the movement, who gave them to understand that they were acting in concert with Bulgaria, backed by Russia, with a view to freeing Macedonia. When these promises failed in their intended effect the bands held over the peasants' heads the destruction of their homes and the abduction of their wives and children, and in cases of persistent refusal recourse was had to murder, as Douco murdered Doukas, of the village of Bousdovo, in the caza of Melnik, as another chief murdered the Khodja-Bachis of Startchovo and Igralichta, in the caza of Petritch. Other individuals, as I have reported frequently, have perished for the same reason."

Further on Sir A. Biliotti quotes the following lines from a letter which he received from Bulgaria: "For sure it is a sight indeed worthy of arousing admiration, the sight of these young heroes of Bulgaria crossing the frontier after winter is ended, going to slay an occasional Turk, and returning to their hearths and homes at once, while thanks to them unarmed peasants abandon their houses and, if they survive to drag themselves across the Bulgarian frontier, sell their live stock at 20 or 30 francs a head to speculators that they may get something so as not to die of hunger."

The Blue-books published by the Foreign Office could be thus summed up: Deeds of violence perpetrated against innocent and unarmed people, acts of brigandage, murders, cruel tortures inflicted on men and on women too, on priests, doctors, and schoolmasters, burnings of churches, dynamite outrages against all friends of law

and order, extermination of Orthodox Christians and Mohammedans, universal terrorism, bloodshed, and incitement to massacre."

The correspondent of the *Novoe Vremya* had the happy inspiration of publishing the chief clauses of the Bulgaro-Macedonian plan of campaign. He says :

"The revolutionary bands are armed and organised by the different committees. Their arms are sent them in particular by the Central Committee, but independently of this every individual member of a band is charged to procure, by whatever means he can, arms and ammunition, so that he may have them in whichever district he is operating. Moreover, those affiliated are obliged to put to death any one who may be named to them by the heads of the committee.

"Always under the orders of these chiefs, they are charged to foment and contrive outbreaks of insurrection. Political crimes are permitted them. Any individual who may try to prevent the success of the revolutionary scheme must be at once suppressed. In every case timely warning must be given to the committee at Sofia, and they are ordered to ask, as far as can be managed, a special authorisation for each murder. Women and children are to be informed as little as possible of the secret proscriptions, as they only offer a weak resistance to the inquiries of the authorities. Members of a band are forbidden to visit their friends and relatives without getting previous permission from the local committees."

The *Struma*, a Bulgarian newspaper, writes as follows on the question :

"More than a hundred Bulgarians belonging to the educated class have been assassinated under the pretext that they were informers or traitors. For two or three years Macedonian Bulgaria has been enslaved by its pretended liberators ; it trembles and groans, and can see no one near from whom it can beg for protection.

"The emissaries of our patriots hold it night and day

under a rule of terror. A little hamlet, Kotsani, was compelled to contribute within a few months a sum of £T300, which was said to be destined for the purchase of arms. Tiny villages have had to buy themselves off at the present day with a ransom of £T1000 or £T2000. Woe to any one refusing; he is immediately killed as a traitor. The Turks watch the spectacle of brother infidels slaying one another, and are pleased, whilst mudirs, kaimakans, and pashas are paid to wink at these crimes. . . . It is true that these patriots occasionally send some arms to Macedonia, but only after payment of £T5. Last month some of them on two occasions carried off from the military depôt of one of the frontier towns of Bulgaria a supply of arms, which they smuggled into Macedonia."

Sir Alfred Biliotti again, in another despatch to his Ambassador, says :

"Acting in this manner, they, far from upholding a noble cause, are only encouraging religious persecution, and in some degree are making themselves accomplices in the murders whose victims are the Patriarchists who refused to abjure and those who refused to join the committees. . . .

"The Bulgarian bands have adopted for some time the habit of bivouacking not in Bulgarian villages, but in villages inhabited by Greeks, who thus appear in the eyes of the Ottoman authorities as their accomplices, which brings upon them the full rigour of Turkish rule, and all the more so because the Hellenes, even more than the Bulgarians, dare not refuse shelter and sustenance to the rebels. And it is remarkable that, despite all the evils they suffer, not one of the Orthodox villages has seen its population pass over *en masse* to the Exarchate, as has happened with certain Vlach villages."

In September 1902 the *Messenger du Gouvernement* of St. Petersburg published an article which terminated in the following manner: "Not having found any assistance for their political projects among the non-

Bulgarian inhabitants of Macedonia, the heads of the movement have been compelled to provoke a general rising in the country, committing acts of violence and cruelty, and spreading terrorism, in order to prevent the projected reforms being carried out. Despite the precautionary measures adopted by the Government at Sofia, the Macedonian agitation has unhappily spread more widely, even in the principality of Bulgaria, because it has been aided by parties who have been foolish enough to believe that the breaking out of the insurrection would compel Russia to change front, and come to the assistance of the visionary schemes and projects of the chiefs of the revolutionary movement. This fatal error, which the Imperial Government has continually combated, has brought on the Christians of the Turkish vilayets terrible sufferings, which can only be ended by preventing fresh bands from crossing from Bulgaria into Turkey, and in thus putting a stop to the revolutionary acts of the committees. Only then will it be possible to demand the immediate application of such reforms as answer to the needs of the population, and which can protect the inhabitants against acts of Turkish cruelty."

In the year 1903 Count Lamsdorff went to Sofia in order to persuade the patriotic Bulgarians to listen to reason, but in vain. In vain did he officially disavow the Bulgaro-Macedonian agitation. In vain he published direct or indirect warnings of the following kind: "It would be a dangerous error on the part of the principality to imagine that the measures taken by Russia are an encouragement to revolutionary agitation, whose continual and criminal activity prevents the pacification of the vilayets and consequently the carrying out of the projected reforms."

"It appears from the reports of the Russian consuls that the peaceful section of the Macedonian population suffers as much from the deeds of the revolutionary bands as from Turkish exactions. These circumstances show how necessary it is for the Bulgarian Government to suppress as energetically as possible the revolutionary

movements, with a view to ending the disturbances in the Balkan Peninsula."

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Government described these acts in November 1903 as follows :

"The insurgents want absolute independence—they want everything, and that at once; and in order to force Europe to give it to them, they allow themselves to commit indescribable deeds. One might say that their blows fall by preference on the heads of the subjects of the Powers with whom the misfortune of their compatriots has found the most sympathy.

"The Ottoman Bank is blown up, the Guadalquivir follows suit; later it is a train which is thrown off the rails, burying under its wreckage a large number of strangers perfectly innocent of the wrongs of Macedonia.

"And, in order to redouble the bitterness of the fate of the inhabitants of this province, to the exactions of the Turkish agents are now added those of the insurgents. Woe betide him who refuses to open his purse or safe! Woe to him who refuses to join the insurgent bands! The code of the internal organisation provides one penalty only for all infractions of its laws, and that is—death.

"You can judge, gentlemen, what is the misery of the inhabitants. Those who are not attached by an unconquerable love to their native soil crowd the offices of the emigration agents.

"‘They fly,’ one of our consuls writes to me, ‘they fly from both Turks and the committees.’"

The *Reform*, the organ of the Bulgarian Supreme Macedonian Committee, thus describes the national quality of the Bulgarians :

"... One of the chief reasons for which Bulgaria, with such an energetic, hard-working, and frugal population, has fallen within twenty years into such a miserable state is this: that it has no educated class, and no

society equal to the task of expelling criminals from its midst.

“Looking at things from a general point of view, Bulgaria gained her freedom, such as it is, without sacrifices. The war of liberation was soon brought to an end, and the country remained almost untouched thereby. Besides this, the Russians threw large amounts of money into it, so that when freedom dawned on Bulgaria the country was flooded with gold. But after less than twenty years, the rich Bulgaria lost her material prosperity, and to-day the country groans in a financial crisis.

“The national riches have been seized and looted. The robbers and spoilers, instead of being despised, enjoy the highest honours in society. And on this account to-day in Bulgaria every one tries to rob and to enrich himself at the expense of the nation. And this is why our beautiful, good, frugal, and hard-working Bulgaria blossomed and withered at once.”

The Bulgarian Minister for Foreign Affairs, M. Daneff, made the following statement in April 1901 to the representative of the Bucharest journal the *Adewerul* :

“The tendencies of the Macedonian committee are to a great extent useless. Macedonia is not inhabited exclusively by Bulgarians, but by Greeks, Roumanians, Servians, and Turks as well. Why then do not all these nationalities complain as much as the Bulgarians with regard to their ridiculous care for Macedonia? The reply is easy : Because the Greeks, the Servians, and the Vlachs in Macedonia confine their activity to the founding of schools and to the preservation of the religious interests of their compatriots, and not to the introduction of arms and other munitions of war, and do not found revolutionary committees and insurgent bands.”

The tendencies of the Bulgarians and their action is most characteristically described by the Montenegrin, Stephen L. Joannovitch in the *Petersburg News* as well as by the Russian journalist, M. A. Amphitheatroff, well

known for his philo-Bulgarian and anti-Greek proclivities, who has visited Macedonia and other countries of the Balkan Peninsula, and describes in the blackest colours the dreadful condition brought about in Macedonia by the Bulgarian crimes and infamies.

The Bulgarian school at Sofia, according to M. Amphitheatroff, is employed as a burning focus of revolutionary propaganda, and its leaders wander freely in Salonica, Monastir, and Skopeia.

The Russian publicist, M. N. Dournovo, treating of the Russian policy in the Orthodox East, writes as follows concerning the Bulgarians and their Macedonian campaign :

“The Greeks retained the Bulgarians in Orthodoxy, but the latter murder both them and their priests, tying them to trees and covering them with petroleum and then burning them. They inflict a similar death upon the peasants. . . .

“What Servian, Greek, or Roumanian does not know that the Bulgarian bishops in Macedonia are members of the Anarchist Macedonian Committee of Sofia, and that they proscribe the Greek, Servian, and Vlach priests, teachers, and others possessed of any authority? How many accusations have not been made against the schismatic archbishops at Skopeia, Divra, and Vitolia?

The Bulgarian deputy Kirkoff a few years ago had the sincerity to characterise in the *Sobranje* the secret desires of the Bulgarians in their true colours. “It is not true,” he said, “that we Bulgarians desire reforms in Macedonia, nor do we wish for autonomy. These phrases are merely formal and are excuses. We Bulgarians wish to annex Macedonia. The argument and action of the committee have given an artificial Macedonian colour to the purely Bulgarian objects and the rapacious appetites. . . .”

A member of the Bulgarian Committee spoke with the utmost boldness to the Sofia correspondent of the *Cologne Gazette*. “Our programme,” he said, “is to

blow up the towns of Macedonia with dynamite : we shall poison the reservoirs ; we shall set the villages on fire ; we shall destroy the harvests, and render useless the telegraph and railway lines, and shall turn Macedonia into a desert. We have large quantities of dynamite at our disposal, and other explosives, arms, food stores, cartridges, and twenty bottles of plague bacteria ! ”

Under the title “ Throw off the Mask,” the Sofia journal *Reformi*, the organ of the Macedonian Committee, publishes in a special edition, bearing a black edge in sign of mourning, a long article on the atrocities and outrages committed by the Bulgarians in Macedonia and Thrace.

This article, which created a great impression in Bulgarian political circles, may be summarised as follows :

“ We are, with great grief, constrained to proclaim the unheard-of atrocities which the well-known Mafia has committed against the unprotected Macedonians, in full knowledge of the responsibility which we bear in denouncing the atrocities perpetrated.”

A correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* furnishes the following information :

“ Macedonia is surely going from bad to worse. The long list of crimes committed by the Christian populations increases daily, and to complete the picture there must be added the murders and acts of violence perpetrated by the Moslem people and the Turkish troops.

“ The Greek propaganda has had a great many brilliant successes. In fact, in some provinces its success has been perfect, for the whole of the vilayet of Monastir has been cleared of the Bulgarian bands, and the villages which were ‘ converted ’ under compulsion from the savage Bulgarian hordes have returned to the bosom of the Patriarchate.

“ Thus the Bulgarians have lost a large number of villages where the Exarchate had exercised authority.”

V

REFORM IN MACEDONIA

IN face of this state of organised anarchy in Macedonia, owing to which all social and political activity has ceased, and on all sides crime has triumphed, with the applause and stimulation of philo-Bulgarian circles of Western Europe who await the solution of the Eastern question and the establishment of a stable political status at the hands of Bulgaria, two of the Powers who are more interested in Macedonia—Austria and Russia—with the mandate of the remainder of the Great Powers, decided to co-operate with a view to the re-establishment of order—each Power, however, naturally looking after its own interests.

Thus the two Emperors met at Mürszteg, and the result of their meeting was the application of the needful reforms in Macedonia with a view to putting an end to the existing anarchy.

These reforms were formulated upon the following basis :

“ In order to ensure the success of the duty entrusted to the Inspector-General, the latter will be retained in his post for a term of several years which will be determined beforehand, and he will not be dismissed from his post before the expiration of that period without the Powers being previously consulted. In this connection he will be authorised to make use (if the maintenance of public order so require) of Ottoman troops, without recourse to the Central Government on each occasion.

“ The Valis will be obliged to conform strictly with his instructions.

“For the reorganisation of the police and gendarmerie the Ottoman Government will employ the co-operation of foreign experts.

“The gendarmerie will be composed of Christians and Mussulmans in proportion to the population of the respective localities.

“The rural guards will be Christian in places where the majority is Christian, in view of the annoyances and excesses which the Christian population has only too often had to suffer at the hands of certain Arnaut malefactors, and seeing that the crimes and offences committed by the latter remain, in the majority of cases, unpunished.

“The Ottoman Government will, without further delay, decide as to the means necessary to put an end to this state of affairs.

“The numerous arrests made in consequence of the recent disturbances in the three vilayets having excited the spirit of the local population, the Ottoman Government, in order to accelerate the return of the normal condition of affairs, will grant an amnesty to all persons accused or condemned for political actions, as well as to those who have emigrated.

“In order to ensure the regular working of the local institutions, the budget of revenue and expenses will be made up in each vilayet, and the provincial receipts controlled by the Ottoman Bank will be in the first place marked off for the needs of the local administration.

“The payment of civil and military services, including the manner of collecting the taxes, will be modified, and wholesale farming out will be abolished.”

Unfortunately, however, owing to the collision of the sentiments of the local populations in Macedonia, as well as on account of the conflicting aspirations and selfish aims of certain Great Powers, not to mention the tactlessness and bad faith of many of the civil and military organs of the Turkish Government, the reforms were not destined to bring about any beneficial result.

This is shown in the official reports of the different European Governments, and by private information beyond suspicion.

Sir Alfred Biliotti, then British Consul-General at Salonica, wrote under date of March 11, 1903, to the Ambassador at Constantinople as follows (*vide* Blue-book, Turkey, No. 1, 1904) :

“I am convinced, on the contrary, that the bands will do their best to oppose the reforms and maintain the present state of disorder, which they themselves called into existence, and which constitutes their *raison d'être* in the eyes of Europe.

“The committees have doubtless a political object, be it autonomy or annexation, and their leaders may be men of the highest motives, but among those affiliated to their bands there are a great number of mere brigands, whose only object in perpetrating murders, &c., is their own personal gain. But whatever be their motives, each party has one and the same object in view, to keep the country in disorder and oppose by all means the introduction of any measure which could calm it.”

But Sir Alfred is not the most vehement denouncer of the disturbances of Macedonia. A despatch from the Russian Consul at Uskub to his Government, dated March 14, 1903, reads as follows :

“ . . . This fact affords a proof that the movement is an artificial one and is not supported by the mass of the population.

“In order to bring the situation to a more acute stage, the committees have recourse to violence and cruelty at the expense of the Turks. Thus recently a band at Perlépé, under one Georges, who had just been granted an amnesty, killed a notable of that town, one Sefeddin Bakhtiar, wrenching out his nails, putting out his eyes, and finally decapitating him. The same day one Detcho Traiko cruelly maltreated a rich man of the place, while Vessel Abdi outraged and then hung his mother, a very old woman. The committees are trying in every way to

provoke general irritation among the Mussulman population and to incite it to a massacre of the Christians."

Sir Alfred also forwarded to his Ambassador at Constantinople a private memorandum, from which the following is an extract :

"It is no sin to betray the intentions and actions of the Bulgarian assassins in order to save the lives of many innocent people.

"The Macedonian officers in the Bulgarian army who have lately served their time are 286. Of those, 180 penetrated, as soon as the amnesty was proclaimed, to Mount Athos, in guise of pilgrims ; most of these officers wear spectacles.

"Every Macedonian or Thracian of the first class is obliged to accept bonds for a sum of from £20 to £50 ; of the second class of from £10 to £30 ; and of the third class of £1 to £8. Death is the penalty of refusal.

"It is the many Bulgarian employees of the railway, especially in Monastir and Salonica vilayets, who put dynamite under the bridges to blow them up when the signal for insurrection is given.

"The general management and the chiefs of the committee are in Salonica. The twelve are stationed here. The sub-committees sit in the cities and towns of Macedonia and Thrace, and give general orders for the accomplishment of their murderous designs."

On April 7 the Consul-General wrote as follows to his Ambassador :

"A Greek and his son were murdered in a mill near Keupreulu, and his wife, who was pregnant, was outraged and disembowelled, the child being afterwards cut in half."

Other similar crimes are mentioned in the Blue-book as being committed against Greeks by the committee.

The following is an extract from a report by Vice-Consul Macgregor on April 19, 1903 :

"It is unlikely that Chakalaroff, whose ruthlessness and tyranny are complained of even by his own partisans,

will neglect an opportunity of retrieving his failure. He appears to enjoy the special confidence of Sarafoff, who on the 11th inst. caused the murder of a certain Ghélé, a leading komitadji of Armensko (near Florina), and his wife, his offence being that he had ventured to criticise the harshness displayed by Chakalaroff in extorting contributions towards the revolutionary fund."

About this Chakalaroff we read in a memorandum in the same Blue-book :

"Chakalaroff constantly preached at Smyrdesh and all the other villages, saying that the Greeks are the worst enemies of the Bulgarians, worse even than the Turks, and no one can call himself a true Bulgarian until he has dipped his hands in the blood of at least one Greek.

"Chakalaroff went not long ago, after Smyrdesh, to the village of Gabris, the inhabitants of which asked him to leave. He answered that since his own village Smyrdesh was destroyed, the rest mattered little, and that the lives of 500 villagers could not balance the life of a single komitadji."

It is known that the Greeks of Monastir, roused by the crimes perpetrated by the Bulgarians against them, threatened at last to take reprisals.

In this connection Sir Alfred Biliotti writes on April 3, 1903, to Sir N. O'Connor :

"I have been told that the Greeks at Monastir, roused at last to action, have warned the Bulgarians resident in the same town that for every Patriarchist murdered by the bands in the country they will murder two Bulgarians in the town. Whether this news is true or not, the fact is that reports of murders from that vilayet have been less frequent of late, and that the bands appear to be limiting themselves to the more profitable employment of exacting money."

A detailed account of the destruction of Kroushevo is contained in the Blue-book, which justly stigmatises this

work of the Bulgarians. After saying that on August 2 some 250 to 300 Bulgarian komitadjis under Pitou Ghoulé, Ghiourtsin, Todor, Haré, and Ivanoff, a Bulgarian soldier, entered the Greek village of Kroushevo at night, looted the shops, and burnt nearly all the houses. The inhabitants, almost naked, ran from house to house to save themselves from the fire and flames. It continues :

“ On Friday morning the inhabitants of Kroushevo, half naked, famished, beaten, sleepless, were crouching at last on the hills outside the town, and gazing with tears at the flames devouring their property ; military cordons surrounded them !

“ Most of the army continued the work of pillage and fire in the now deserted town, and only stopped before the Bulgarian quarter . . . which has remained intact. This miracle is due, they say, to some whispered negotiations which took place with Bulgarians, and to a golden powder which rose round the Turks and prevented them from seeing that quarter. This is very characteristic, and proves not only the corruption on the one side, but the immoral suppleness, the guile, and the practical spirit on the other, in inventing means at the critical moment.

“ About forty or fifty komitadjis were killed and wounded during the time the firing continued on the fortifications and hills on the day of the Turkish occupation. Ivanoff and Pitou Ghoule were among the dead ; the others bravely took to flight or surrendered, leaving everything to the mercy of the Turks, after they had prepared the catastrophe. In the army also some twenty men were killed, or in most cases wounded.

“ In the forty-eight hours during which the soldiers and Bashi-Bozouks were in the town there were :

“ 366 houses burnt and 600 pillaged.

“ 203 warehouses and shops burnt and pillaged.

“ 44 men and women killed in the streets and houses, 41 of whom were Patriarchists and only three Bulgarians.”

The crimes mentioned in the Blue book are innumerable. On almost every one of its 300 odd pages two or three crimes or murders are enumerated.

With regard to the insurrectionary movement, and the failure of the Bulgarian propaganda, the British Vice-Consul at Serres, wrote under date of May 26, 1903 :

“I have the honour to report to you upon the general outlook of the political situation in the sandjak of Serres since the recent occurrences.

“The latest attempt of the Bulgarian committees, who have tried to attract public attention by anarchical outrages at Salonica and elsewhere, and to force the European Powers to intervene, has been definitely frustrated, and the fictitious movement planned in Macedonia, and fomented solely by terrorism, has come to nothing, and the victims are cursing the authors of these tragic and sanguinary proceedings.”

Another interesting document published in the Blue-book gives the orders of the chiefs of the bands to their followers. This document, written in Bulgarian, was found upon the body of one of the leaders, Boris Sfetkoff, who was killed in June 1905.

The following are extracts therefrom :

“Any Christian, in whatever village, who is found to be harmful, or who refuses his assistance, must be killed of deliberate purpose, in such manner that the blame may, if possible, be thrown upon the forest guard, ‘bailli,’ imam, or dere-bey, and with this object two witnesses must be forthcoming who will try to persuade the court that the murder has been committed by tyrants of this kind. In such cases evidence must be given with full conviction and assurance. The band must acquire in each village devoted members who will personally wreak vengeance on the oppressors. A member must sacrifice himself for the disappearance of a dere-bey or of a denouncer of the village or of a neighbouring village. Thus the responsibility will be divided, and it will not be possible to drag the whole population *en masse* before the courts.”

The Blue-book mentions the destruction of an entire Greek family, that of Saramandis, composed of four members, two of whom were women. This took place at the hands of a Bulgarian band under Youvan at the village of Vaviané.

The official reports of the other Great Powers also contain accounts of innumerable Bulgarian outrages against the Greeks.

The massacre of the Greek inhabitants of six villages near the town of Basilikon on the Black Sea, and the destruction of seventeen villages near Saranta Ekklesias in Thrace, are quite recent events.

The Bulgarian savages descended from the hills one night, and with fire and sword destroyed all they found, whilst off those very shores the Russian fleet was engaged in making a naval demonstration against Turkey on account of the murder of the Russian Consul at Monastir by the Albanians. The unfortunate inhabitants with their wives and children took refuge in their boats, and many were thus saved ; 500 women and children reached the Bosphorus, where the Ambassadors of the Great Powers had the opportunity of seeing them, naked and starving

Affairs being in this condition, and the Bulgarian crimes in Macedonia increasing from day to day, the necessity for armed defence of the Greek inhabitants of Macedonia against the Bulgarian invaders was at last seen by them to be unavoidable, in view of the fact that the Bulgarians were being supported by the military representatives of certain Great Powers who are interested in the maintenance of anarchy, and that the Turkish Government, as I have already stated, was either unwilling or unable to restore order, and that, even in case it should take severe and drastic measures for the purpose, it would probably call forth the opposition and intervention of the interested Powers.

VI

DEFENSIVE MEASURES BY GREEKS IN MACEDONIA

"GREECE is compelled to make a desperate effort in order to secure a portion of Macedonia large enough so as not to be cut off from Constantinople, the possession of which is the common hope of the Hellenic race.

"But Russia has for a long time laboured in order to include the whole of Macedonia, and especially Mount Athos, in the boundaries of Slavism."

Thus wrote Sir H. Layard in June 1877 to Lord Derby.

The English statesman was right; he had, moreover, never shown any special sympathy or love for Greece. Macedonia must be the basis of a strong Greek state which shall contain all the divisions of the Greek race. The Greek nation, wronged and insulted as unwarlike in permitting the handing over of its ancestral inheritance to the Bulgarians, considered that it had a duty to perform in taking action in Macedonia.

The Greco-Macedonian bands were thus formed two years ago, with the prime object of repelling the Bulgarian invaders of Macedonia.

It is true that these bands, which are formed for the most part from natives of Macedonia, have been joined by men from other parts of free and enslaved Greece without, let it be said, the consent or approval of the Greek Government. But who can dispute the right of these bands to co-operate in the national defence with people of the same race who have suffered in the same way, always striving on behalf of the national rights, and who comprehend in their care for the national rehabilitation that without Macedonia the Hellenic fatherland is endangered?

This is the reason for their co-operation.

Certain European Governments have declared against these Greco-Macedonian bands and their action, which has sometimes met with misfortunes; but, generally speaking, the blame in respect of systematic criminal intentions which attaches to the action of the Bulgarian committees cannot be applied to them.

May I be permitted to express my grief, the grief of every just and sincere man, that while no notice is taken of, and no indignation caused by, the crimes of the Bulgarian bands, certain Governments are demanding the dispersion of the Greco-Macedonian bands? By what right can one say to a people who understand the danger which threatens their national existence, "*Give up your rights, commit suicide*"? This is indeed characteristic of the moral condition of our days.

The Porte has just received an official report on the Christian bands—Bulgarian, Greek, and Servian—which are operating in Macedonia and in the vilayet of Kossovo. The report does not mention the bands which are acting on behalf of the Roumanians, probably because they are almost entirely composed of Mussulmans.

These bands are distributed as follows under each vilayet :

VILAYET OF SALONICA.

Cazas.	Bulgarian Bands.	Greek Bands.
1. Vodena	2	2
2. Yennitsa	4	4
3. Stroumnitsa	1	0
4. Tikfes	1	0
5. Avret-Hissar	1	0
6. Ghevgheli	6	0
7. Karaferria	1	1
8. Langada	0	3
9. Katerina	0	1
10. Kassandra	0	1
11. Melenik	7	0
12. Ano Djoumaya	5	0
13. Demir Hissar	2	0
14. Petritsi	1	0
15. Razlog	1	0
16. Sihna	6	0
	38	12

On examining this list it will be observed that it refers only to the sandjaks of Salonica and Serres; the third sandjak, that of Drama, is passed over in silence. There are, however, five Bulgarian bands operating in this sandjak, but the small number of men composing these bands has caused them to be neglected in the official Turkish report.

VILAYET OF MONASTIR.

Cazas.	Bulgarian Bands.	Greek Bands.	Servian Bands.
Perlepe	5	1	4
Caradjova	3	0	2
Castoria	6	5	0
Monastir	3	3	0
Florina	3	1	0
Ochrida	3	0	0
	23	10	6

VILAYET OF KOSSOVO.

Cazas.	Bulgarian Bands.	Servian Bands.
Uskub	1	0
Istip	1	0
Coumanovo	4	2
Radovista	1	0
Karatovo	1	0
Osmanie	3	0
Velessa	1	1
Pinga	2	3
Kotsana	1	0
	15	6

The representatives of certain European Powers have addressed remonstrances to both Athens and Constantinople. But they remain indifferent when it is a question of Bulgaria, Roumania, or Servia, since it is no secret—above all, in diplomatic circles—that armed operation in Macedonia is not confined to Hellenic sources, but is carried on chiefly by the Bulgarians, and also by Servians

(whose action, especially of late, has increased and taken an anti-Bulgarian character), not to mention the Roumanian, Albanian, and Mussulman bands.

Wherefore this indignation against the Greek bands only, and not equally against the Bulgarian, Servian, and Roumanian bands?

VII

AN HISTORICAL PARALLEL

MAY I be permitted to make an historical incursion into the past and recall some events of thirty years ago?

No one is ignorant of the massacres of Batak and Cavarna in Bulgaria, then a Turkish province. The Bashi-Bozouks committed every species of atrocity on the Bulgarian inhabitants of certain districts who had risen against the Turkish rule during the insurrection of Herzegovina.

Official Europe remained apathetic. "Ein Bischen Erzegovine" exclaimed the Mephistopheles of the German Empire, at a political soirée given at his palace, and he turned his attention to the domestic affairs of Germany, declaring that the Eastern question was not worth the bones of a single Pomeranian grenadier.

What did the British Government do at this moment?

England remained indifferent, as did the whole of Europe, with Germany at its head, to the events taking place in the Balkan Peninsula.

In fact, I may add that the policy of the United Kingdom showed the greatest sympathy for the Turkish Government, and evinced no desire to accept as true the accusations brought against the organs of that Government of criminal conduct against the revolted peasantry of Bulgaria.

The British Government concealed these events from the British public, either out of indifference or from incorrigibility, as Gladstone said at the time.

Fortunately, the manager of a Liberal journal, the *Daily News*, assigned to one of its correspondents the duty of verifying the events of that fearful affair.

Indignation seized the public opinion of England on account of the occurrences. At the same time (June 26, 1876) the Duke of Argyll in the House of Lords and Mr. Forster in the House of Commons addressed impatient questions with regard to the report of the correspondent of the *Daily News*. After the commotion caused in England and on the Continent, detailed reports were published with regard to the Balkan and Danubian provinces, and the truth of the ravages of the Kurds and Bashi-Bozouks therein was laid bare.

At that critical moment Gladstone shot his political bolt in connection with the occurrences. This was the publication of his pamphlet, *Bulgarian Atrocities*.

I may here be allowed to observe, Sir, that the crimes committed in Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia, during the last few months, from July until the present time (December 1906), against the Greek population, do not differ in the least degree from those which took place exactly thirty years ago and in that very country.

The only difference is that then the chief actors were Mussulman, whereas they now are Christian Bashi-Bozouks — Bulgarians.

But, as then the Turkish, so now the Bulgarian Government is no stranger to the events.

I must nevertheless observe, in addressing an English gentleman, that the British Government has lately taken a one-sided view of the events of the Balkan Peninsula; nor is it out of place for me to repeat to-day the words of Mr. W. H. Smith in the House of Commons in 1878, that it "followed the merciless policy of excessive egotism."

British diplomacy has especially caused harm to poor Greece. I am seized with grief on reading in both unofficial and official English publications inaccuracies concerning the crimes perpetrated in Bulgaria and Macedonia on the innocent Christian population, crimes which have been more than once acknowledged, not only by foreigners, but by the very Bulgarians themselves.

A few days since, the *Bulgaria*, organ of the Bulgarian Premier, M. Daneff, wrote as follows :

“The acts of violence of every description committed and continuing to be committed in our country ; the acts of brigandage, the incendiarisms, the daily encounters, the thefts, and to sum up, the crimes against the person, property, and honour of the citizens of every race, tend to a great extent to show that the country has become an important factor of anarchy. In addition, the attitude of the Great Powers and of the European Press clearly shows that as such is Bulgaria looked upon abroad.”

And yet there are people, more especially in England, who cast the responsibility for these crimes upon the Greeks of Macedonia and of Bulgaria ! According to publications which we have seen, the work of credible witnesses, and official documents, certified not only by Europe but by Bulgaria herself, the authorities of that country themselves took part in the destruction of Anchialos, the outrages at Philippopolis, and in other Bulgarian towns.

Nobody any more disputes the truth of these facts.

A portion only of the English Press passes them over in silence, or denies them, or, worse, justifies them.

Is not an examination on the spot imposed on Europe, and especially on English public opinion, in the name of philanthropy and of civilisation, in order that it may be persuaded that it has a duty to perform in deliberating more seriously with regard to the fate of populations which it has handed over with a light conscience to a political status little differing from the most savage and tyrannical which history has to show ?

I consider that I have sufficiently described in the foregoing pages the national and political character of the people, to whom from time to time congratulations are addressed on its action, and wishes expressed for the continuance of this action, in the Balkan Peninsula.

I invoke the verdict of the civilised world.

VIII

CONCLUSION

IN the first page of a book published some twenty years ago, full of life and truth, which you, Sir, above all others, have felt and considered, I read the following :

“Never since the fall of Napoleon has brutal force held so considerable a place in Europe as to-day. . . . It is not certainly from to-day only that nations are tempted to seize by violence the property of others, but at least in other days they tried to save appearances.” *

I call for the aid of him who wrote these words to protest against the *brutal force* which, as a political discoverer, he stigmatised in a special publication, but which he may also stigmatise as a practical statesman. With regard to the real *Bulgarian Atrocities* committed a few months ago in the Bulgarian principality, in which the organs of that Government took part with impunity, he can do, with the same right, what thirty years ago was done by his magnanimous countryman, William Gladstone, in a similar case, when he launched at the British public and the civilised world that famous book in which he stigmatised so unmercifully but justly the outrages of the Bashi-Bozouks of the Ottoman Power on the Christians of the Balkan countries.

Believe me that the authors of both these atrocities, those of 1876 and those of 1906, do not differ in the least degree.

* “Jamais, depuis la chute de Napoléon, la force brutale n'a tenu en Europe une place aussi considérable qu'à l'époque actuelle . . . Ce n'est pas d'aujourd'hui, sans doute, que les nations sont tentées de saisir par violence le bien d'autrui ; mais, du moins, s'efforçait-on autrefois de sauver les apparences.”—CHARLES DILKE, “L'Europe en 1887.” Paris.

Both peoples came from the same land, both have made a name for their criminal conception of life, with the sole difference that the Turks represent Islam, and the Bulgarians, assimilated to the Slav peoples, adopted Christianity without, however, their original character being in the least changed. Facts speak for themselves. Concerning both, may one repeat Gladstone's phrase: "They were, upon the whole, from the black day when they first entered Europe, the one great anti-human specimen of humanity."

I address myself in the name of the Hellenic race, that race which is so much undervalued and persecuted by political speculation, to him who has so often protested against the *brutal force* which prevails in Europe, and before which justice and truth are compelled to give way.

He is one of the strongest and most intellectual spirits of Great Britain—strong in the face of falsehood and hypocrisy, unbending and invincible in the support of truth.

The Greek nation calls with confidence upon him to support their rights, and that nation has no doubt that it will find in that man a most powerful and just advocate of their trampled and neglected rights.





